CANADIAN THESIS

THESES CANADIENNES

THUE, Laura A.

GENDER AND THE SOCIAL
PROCESSES OF VIOLENCE: THE ...

ISBN 0-612-88059-1
NQ-88059
1 of 4

In compliance with the
Canadian Privacy Legislation
some supporting forms
may have been removed from
this dissertation.

While these forms may be included
in the document page count,
their removal does not represent
any loss of content from the dissertation.

University of Alberta

Gender and the Social Processes of Violence: the Interaction Between Personal and Situational Factors

by

Laura A. Thue ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Department of Sociology

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 2003

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisisitons et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-612-88059-1
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-612-88059-1

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou aturement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Canadä

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Laura A. Thue

Title of Thesis: Gender and the Social Processes of Violence: the Interaction Between Personal and Situational Factors

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year this Degree Granted: 2003

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Date submitted: July 9, 2003

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "*Gender and the Social Processes of Violence: the Interaction Between Personal and Situational Factors*", submitted by Laura A. Thue in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. Tim Hartnagel

Dr. Helen Boritch

Dr. Michael Gillespie

Dr. Jack Goldberg

Dr. Harvey Krahn

Dr. Vincent Sacco
Queens University

Date Approved: June 26th, 2003

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to Dean for his love, support and encouragement, and for his endless patience.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the effects of gender, person characteristics and situational factors on the use of force in conflict situations. A great deal of violence research concentrates on person characteristics and does not consider situational factors. Moreover, much of this research focuses on male offenders. In contrast, this study adopts an integrated approach, placing emphasis on the combined and potential interaction effects of gender, person and situational factors.

The theoretical framework for this study is routine conflict theory. The theory suggests that when faced with conflict, individuals draw on behavioural repertoires as triggered by social cues from the situation. Hence, violence is seen as only one of a number of options that may be considered during such interactions.

The data set was compiled from a representative survey of 2052 people living in Alberta and Manitoba, Canada. The sample consists of an equal distribution of male and female respondents. Respondents were first asked about a number of person characteristics such as self-control, attitudes towards violence, fear of crime and past victimization experiences. Next, to test the effects of situational factors on the use of force, randomly selected, hypothetical scenarios were presented to the respondents. Logistic regression was used to test the model.

The results reveal that the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* (gender-dynamic) is the strongest finding. Males are more willing than females to use force against a male rather than a female harm doer. The results indicate that it is important to examine gender at the situational level of analysis and that gender-

dynamic must be a primary focus. The results also show that domain and type of scenario are among the strongest variables in the model.

The primary limitation of the current study is that the use of hypothetical scenarios only allows us to investigate whether respondents believe they *would* use force as a means for dealing with conflict. Whether or not this perceived willingness translates into the actual use of force in real-life conflict situations is not examined. Suggestions for future research are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are so many people I want to thank for their support, encouragement and guidance. I would like to begin by expressing my sincerest gratitude to my thesis supervisor and mentor, Dr. Tim Hartnagel. Dr. Hartnagel has invariably gone out of his way to assist and guide me through my doctoral research. I wish to thank him for his patience and encouragement and for teaching me to think more critically about my own work and the work of others.

I would next like to acknowledge the significant contributions of the other two members of my committee, Dr. Helen Boritch and Dr. Mike Gillespie. Dr. Boritch has been a source of inspiration to me and her insights have made my dissertation a stronger piece of work. Dr. Gillespie directed me through a very complicated analysis and in the process taught me how to manage a large data set and how to conduct a thorough analysis.

In addition to my committee, several other people need to be recognized for their roles in this process. Dr. Jack Goldberg participated in both my candidacy exam and my final defence and provided me with invaluable feedback on both occasions. Dr. Vincent Sacco of Queens University served as my external and I am grateful to him for reviewing my work. Dr. Harvey Krahn replaced Dr. Sacco at my final defence on short notice and I wish to extend my appreciation to him for doing so. I also want to thank Dr. Raymond Corrado of Simon Fraser University. If it were not for his persuasion I may not have pursued my PhD at all.

Dr. Leslie Kennedy and Dr. David Forde each played a fundamental role in this research as well. These individuals collected the original data and invited me to use it for my own research. In addition, they provided a wealth of assistance with the data set. I sincerely appreciate their responses to my many emails filled with questions.

I would next like to acknowledge Lynn Van Reede, our graduate administrator. Over the past several years Lynn has done a great deal for me. She works extremely hard for all of her graduate students and without her we would be lost.

I certainly could not have endured graduate school without the endless support of my family and friends. These people have been there to cheer me on, and when I needed to blow off steam my friends were always ready and willing to participate with enthusiasm.

Finally, there is one person that has had to share my challenges with me, and that is my partner Dean. Dean has been there through the good days and the bad days, and the very bad days. He has had to tolerate the many hours it takes to complete a thesis while working a full time job, which often meant that we had little time to spend together. I will always be grateful to him for this.

I thank all of these individuals for helping me to achieve my goals. It has been a lengthy journey and I feel very fortunate to have had so many people to turn to for direction, reassurance and humor along the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction 1

Project Summary 1

What Is Violence 4

The Problem of Violence in Canada 10

Traditional Approaches to the Study of Violence 14

    The Individual versus Structure 15

The Person-Situation Debate In Social Psychology 22

    The Trait Position 23

    The Situationist Position 24

    The Interactionist Position 26

    Summarizing the Person-Situation Debate 28

    Defining the 'Interaction' Component in Interactionism 29

Person, Situation and the Study of Violence 30

Gender and Violence 34

Major Research Questions 37

Contributions of the Current Research 38

Organization of the Dissertation 39

CHAPTER TWO: Studying People Situations and Violence 40

Introduction 40

Person Factors and Violence 40

- Gender 41
- Early Biological and Psychological Theories 42
- Feminism and the Study of Crime and Criminality 43
    - The Liberation Thesis 45
    - Role Theory 45
    - Reconceptualizing Gender as Situational 46
- Summary of Gender and Crime Literature 47
- The General Theory of Crime 48
- Tests of the General Theory 50
- Summary of the General Theory 52
- Age 52
- Attitudes Towards Violence 53
- Fear of Crime 54
- Past Victimization Experiences 55
- Summary of Person Factors 55

Situational Factors and Violence 56

Defining and Operationalizing Situation 57

Situational Analysis Defined 59

Gender of Harm Doer 59

Age of Harm Doer 60

Intensity 60

Bystanders 61

Summarizing Situational Analysis 62

The Contribution of Opportunity Theories to the Study of Violent Situations 63

Lifestyle-Exposure Theory 64

Routine Activities Theory 64

Rational Choice Theory 66

Summary of the Contribution of the Opportunity Perspective 68

The Current Study: Bridging the Person and the Situation 69

Routine Conflict Theory and the Analysis of Person, Situation and Violence..........70

Social Constructionism 71

The Criminal Event Perspective 72

Coercion Theory: The Social Interactionist Perspective 74

  Modeling the Evolution of Disputes....76
  Summarizing and Application of Routine Conflict Theory....77
The Present Trend in Criminological Research....79
Preliminary Findings from Kennedy and Forde....80
The Interactionist Model and Violence....83
  Individual Level of Analysis: Person Factors....84
    Gender of Respondent....84
    Age of Respondent....85
    Low Self-Control....85
    Attitudes Towards Violence....86
    Fear of Crime....86
    Past Victimization....87
  Situational Level of Analysis: Situational Factors....88
    Upset....88
    Gender of Harm Doer....88
    Age of Harm Doer....89
    Intensity....89
    Respondent Alone....90

Interaction Effects 90

Hypotheses For the Current Research 90

Person Characteristics 91

Situational Factors 91

Interaction Hypotheses 92

Research Questions 92

Chapter Summary 93

CHAPTER THREE: Data, Methods and Sample Characteristics 95

Introduction 95

Research Design and Sample 95

Data Collection 96

The Research Instrument 97

Table 3.1: The Conflict Scenarios 99

Table 3.2: Distribution of Scenarios by Trial 102

Setting Up the Data: Creating the Trials 103

Strengths and Limitations of Using Hypothetical Scenarios 105

Operationalization of the Variables 108

Dependent Variable: Aggression 108

Independent Variables: Person Characteristics....111

Gender of Respondent....111

Age of Respondent....112

Low Self-Control....112

Attitudes Towards Violence....115

Fear of Crime....118

Past Victimization....118

Independent Variables: Situational Factors....119

Upset (Naming)....119

Gender of Harm Doer....120

Age of Harm Doer....120

Intensity of the Attack....120

Respondent Alone....120

Interaction Terms....121

Centering....121

Summary of the Model....121

Testing the Hypotheses: Logistic Regression....122

Logistic Regression....122

Sample Characteristics 124

Independent Variables 125

  Table 3.3: Respondent Characteristics (N=2052) 125

  Table 3.4: Past Victimization 127

  Situational Factors (N=2052) 128

  Table 3.5: Upset 128

Dependent Variable 129

  Table 3.6: Upset, Claiming and Aggression 130

  Table 3.7: Aggression: Willingness to Use Physical Force 131

Chapter Summary 132

CHAPTER FOUR: Logistic Regression Results 133

Introduction 133

Comparing the Four Trials 135

  Table 4.1: Coefficients and Odds Ratios 135

Interpretation of the Results 135

  Person Characteristics 136

  Situational Factors 137

  Interaction Terms 138

    Age of Respondent * Upset 138

    Table 4.2: Yes to Use Force by Age of Respondent and Upset 139

    Gender of Respondent by Gender of Harm Doer 139

    Table 4.3: Trial One Yes to Force (N = 2043) 139

    Table 4.4: Trial Two Yes to Force (N=2034) 139

    Table 4.5: Trial Three Yes to Force (N=2039) 140

    Table 4.6: Trial Four Yes to Force (N=2035) 140

Gender, Person and Situation Interactions 141

    Table 4.7: Trial Three Yes to Force by Gender and Attitudes (N=1779) 141

    Table 4.8: Trial Three Yes to Force by Gender and Intensity (N=2041) 142

Summary 143

Willingness to Use Force by Social Domain and Scenario 143

    Table 4.9: Willingness to Use Physical Force by Domain 143

    Table 4.10: Willingness to Use Force by Scenario 144

Exploring the Effects of Domain and Scenario 145

    Table 4.11: Trial One 147

    Table 4.12: Trial Two 148

    Table 4.13: Trial Three 149

Table 4.14: Trial Four 150

Discussion 150

Gender, Domain and Scenario 154

Chapter Summary 156

CHAPTER FIVE: Summary and Conclusions 159

Introduction 159

Review of the Theoretical Framework 159

Summary of Research Findings 161

Person Characteristics 161

Gender of Respondent 161

Age of Respondent 163

Low Self-control 165

Attitudes Towards Violence 168

Fear of Crime 170

Past Victimization 171

Summary of Person Factors 173

Situational Factors 173

Upset 173

        Intensity.....174

        Gender of Harm Doer.....175

        Age of Harm Doer.....175

        Respondent Alone.....176

    Summary of Situational Factors.....177

    Interaction Terms.....178

        Gender * Gender * Alone.....178

        Gender * Gender.....179

        Age of Respondent * Upset.....183

        Summary of Interaction Terms.....184

    Domain and Scenario.....185

Summary of Themes.....186

Implications of the Findings.....188

Contributions of the Current Research.....192

Study Limitations.....194

Suggestions for Future Research.....197

    Scenario One.....201

    Scenario Two.....202

Endnotes....................206

References....................212

Appendix A....................226

Interview Instrument....................227

Appendix B....................262

  Scenarios....................263

    The Work Domain....................263

    The Street Domain....................263

    The Domestic Domain....................264

    The Leisure Domain....................264

Appendix C....................265

  Trials Broken Down by Scenario....................266

  Table C.1: Trial One (S1Type)....................266

  Table C.2: Trial Two (S2Type)....................266

  Table C.3: Trial Three (S3Type)....................266

  Table C.4: Trial Four (S4Type)....................267

Appendix D....................268

  Table D.1: Selected Pooled Regression Findings from Kennedy and Forde....................269

Table D.2: Upset, Claiming and Aggression by Scenario 269

Appendix E 270

Two Forms of the Dependent Variable...271

Trial One 271

Table E.1: Dependent Variable One 271

Table E.2: Dependent Variable Two 271

Trial Two 272

Table E.3: Dependent Variable One 272

Table E.4: Dependent Variable Two 272

Trial Three 273

Table E.5: Dependent Variable One 273

Table E.6: Dependent Variable Two 273

Trial Four 274

Table E.7: Dependent Variable One 274

Table E.8: Dependent Variable Two 274

Appendix F...275

Self-control Questions and Scales 275

Original Scale of Self-control from Grasmick et. al. (1993) 275

Modifications made by Kennedy and Forde (1999) 277

The Scale Used in the Current Study 278

Appendix G 281

Table G.1: Gender of Harm Doer 282

Table G.2: Age of Harm Doer 282

Table G.3: Level of Intensity 282

Table G.4: Respondent Alone 282

Appendix H 283

Table H.1: Willingness to Use Force by Scenario and Gender (% Yes) 284

Appendix I 285

Table I.1: Use of Force by Gender-dynamic and Respondent Alone by Trial 286

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: The Conflict Scenarios 99

Table 3.2: Distribution of Scenarios by Trial 102

Table 3.3: Respondent Characteristics..125

Table 3.4: Past Victimization...127

Table 3.5: Upset...128

Table 3.6: Upset, Claiming and Aggression 130

Table 3.7: Aggression: Willingness to Use Physical Force.....................................131

Table 4.1: Coefficients and Odds Ratios 135

Table 4.2: Yes to Use Force by Age of Respondent and Upset...............................139

Table 4.3: Trial One Yes to Force 139

Table 4.4: Trial Two Yes to Force...139

Table 4.5: Trial Three Yes to Force..140

Table 4.6: Trial Four Yes to Force..140

Table 4.7: Trial Three Yes to Force by Gender and Attitudes.................................141

Table 4.8: Trial Three Yes to Force by Gender and Intensity 142

Table 4.9: Willingness to Use Physical Force by Domain 143

Table 4.10: Willingness to Use Force by Scenario 144

Table 4.11: Trial One 147

Table 4.12: Trial Two 148

Table 4.13: Trial Three 149

Table 4.14: Trial Four 150

Table C.1: Trial One (S1Type) 266

Table C.2: Trial Two (S2Type) 266

Table C.3: Trial Three (S3Type) 266

Table C.4: Trial Four (S4Type) 266

Table D.1: Selected Pooled Regression Findings from Kennedy and Forde 269

Table D.2: Upset, Claiming and Aggression by Scenario 269

Table E.1: Dependent Variable One 271

Table E.2: Dependent Variable Two 271

Table E.3: Dependent Variable One 272

Table E.4: Dependent Variable Two 272

Table E.5: Dependent Variable One 273

Table E.6: Dependent Variable Two 273

Table E.7: Dependent Variable One 274

Table E.8: Dependent Variable Two 274

Table G.1: Gender of Harm Doer 282

Table G.2: Age of Harm Doer 282

Table G.3: Level of Intensity 282

Table G.4: Respondent Alone 282

Table H.1: Willingness to Use Force by Scenario and Gender 284

Table I.1: Use of Force by Gender-dynamic and Respondent Alone by Trial 286

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

Project Summary

This study investigates the relative contribution of person characteristics and situational factors to the willingness of an individual to use violence as a means for dealing with conflict. The effect of gender in relation to the use of violence is a central theme in this research. With regard to the study of violence, much research places emphasis on the attributes of individual violent offenders, especially male offenders. Examined in isolation however, individual level research analyses are restricted in that they do not allow for the consideration of situational effects related to violence. This is critical because, while it is commonly assumed that person characteristics predispose certain types of behaviour, in actuality, even those individuals who may be considered prone to violence are not violent in every situation. Thus, it is necessary to integrate these levels of analysis for the purpose of exploring how person characteristics come together with situational factors to facilitate a violent outcome.

Kennedy and Forde (1999) point out, however, that while this kind of an approach has been discussed theoretically, empirical testing of such models has been limited. In contrast, this study adopts an integrated approach to the study of violence. Emphasis is placed on the combined and potential interaction effects of individual level person characteristics such as attitudes towards violence, and micro level situational factors such as the presence of bystanders. In addition, this research focuses in on the relationship between gender and violence. The primary objective of this study is to identify the characteristics of both males and females who are most likely to use violence and the circumstances under which violence is most likely to be interpreted by these individuals as an option for resolving conflict.

This study is conducted from the perspective of the routine conflict theory developed by Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999). This theoretical framework brings together components of social constructionist approaches, coercion theory and the criminal event perspective for the purpose of analyzing and explaining criminal events. From this standpoint, violence is not viewed as purely expressive and impulsive; rather, the assumption is that when faced with conflict, individuals draw on behavioural repertoires as triggered by social cues from the situation in ways that may or may not result in a violent outcome. Hence, this research shifts the focus from violence as a purely psychological reaction to understanding violent behaviour as one of a number of options that may be considered during conflict-oriented interactions. Using routine conflict theory, this study will extend the research of Kennedy and Forde (1999) through its focus on the potential interaction effects among person characteristics and key situational variables, as well as through the concentration on the effects of gender in relation to the social processes of violence.

These research objectives will be achieved through the analysis of data collected by Kennedy and Forde via a telephone survey in 1994, which resulted in a final sample of 2052 respondents. In one portion of the survey, respondents were presented with four of twelve randomly selected, hypothetical, conflict-oriented scenarios and asked whether or not they would respond with physical force. These scenarios provide rich detail regarding situational variations in an individual's willingness to use violence as a means for dealing with conflict. In a second portion of the survey, respondents were presented with questions relating to self-control, attitudes towards violence, fear of crime and personal experiences with victimization. Using these two components of the survey together, these data afford a sufficient opportunity to test for combined and interaction effects of person characteristics and situational factors as they relate to violence.

A critical difference between the current research and that of Kennedy and Forde (1999) is the unit of analysis. In the original Conflict Study the unit of analysis was the scenario. These researchers examined *situations* that were most likely to produce a violent outcome (Kennedy and Forde 1999). In contrast, the unit of analysis in the present study is the respondent. This research examines whether or not particular individuals in particular situations are willing to use physical force as a means for dealing with conflict.

The general paucity of systematic testing of integrated models of violence, particularly those that include a close examination of the effects of gender, suggests the considerable importance and need for this research. Through the empirical location of significant individual and situational factors, a much more powerful understanding of the processes associated with violence will be achieved. In view of the fact that existing violence research has neglected potential interaction effects among individual and situational factors, this study represents a significant extension of past research. Further, the adoption of an integrated model facilitates the more specific location of gender effects in the use of violence—something that has also been greatly neglected—and will thus make a valuable contribution to ongoing research in the area of gender and violence.

What Is Violence?

Violence is a social problem of interest and concern to researchers and the general public alike. We are at the same time curious and disturbed by objectionable acts committed by members of our society. Our simultaneous fascination and fear is fueled in part by highly sensationalized cases such as the violent murders committed by Ted Bundy, Clifford Olson and a multitude of others (Levin and Fox 1985). Nevertheless, the reality is that serial murder and other types of violence that involve strangers' premeditated attacks on unsuspecting victims do not represent the typical character of violence in Canada. Instead, a great deal of violence occurs between individuals who are known to one another and who are experiencing some form of conflict. Moreover, even violence that occurs between strangers is often the end result of a conflict-oriented social transaction.

Fortunately, many individuals will never be involved in violence—either as a victim or as an offender. Still, people hear and learn about violence through the experiences of others as communicated in personal interactions and from information filtered through the media. Oftentimes however, individuals are misinformed about the nature of violence that occurs. Subjective perceptions commonly prevail in terms of beliefs about the extent and characteristics of violence in general, and risk for personal victimization in particular. Moreover, social responses to violence are affected by these subjective perceptions.

Before we can effectively investigate the characteristics of violence, however, or consider the actual extent of violence that takes place, it is first necessary to pose the question 'what *is* violence'? While most people are able to conceptualize what violence means for them; there is no universal consensus within or across societies as to the exact definition of violence. Consequently, it is important to consider the origin and nature of definitions of violence in contemporary Western society. Relatedly, it is also important to locate factors that are responsible for the distinction that is commonly made between 'legitimate' and 'illegitimate' forms of violence, in other words, factors that determine when violence will be tolerated or accepted as opposed to when it will not. Knowing more about how violence is defined and the situations within which it is sometimes accepted will lead to a stronger understanding of the processes associated with the actual occurrence of violence.

In this study it is argued that the interpretation of a particular situation as legitimizing the use of violence relates to both the characteristics of individuals and the characteristics of specific situations. Person characteristics such as gender, age, attitudes, experiences and personality shape how individuals perceive situations and therefore how they respond to a particular set of circumstances.

To illustrate, in the case where one person physically strikes another, the physical action of hitting, the circumstances of the situation (such as the presence of bystanders) and the resulting physical harm may be perceived differently by different individuals. Thus, whether or not a particular physical action is first, defined as violent, and second, deemed as legitimate or necessary, is a matter of interpretation.

To explain further, if the physical action of hitting occurs between two boxers in an arena, the incident will be defined as violent by some but not others, and will be viewed by many as legitimate sport rather than criminal assault. For another example, depending on situational circumstances some people might legitimize the use of physical force against a male, while viewing the same level of force used against a female in the same situation as abhorrent. In this case, while the physical action is the same, one situational factor—namely the gender of the target—has changed, and therefore the meaning attached to the action and to the situation may also change.

Ultimately, there is no single universal definition of what constitutes violence, nor is there a universal consensus on what circumstances may legitimate the use of violence. Instead, the definition of violence and the circumstances under which it may sometimes be tolerated or even expected reflect changing perceptions across time, cultures, social groups, individuals and situations. To illustrate, Forgas (1986: 46) states that "in everyday life, implicit perceptions of what constitutes aggression are highly dependent on subjective and contextual factors." At the same time however, in order for a society to function without chaos, a certain level of agreement regarding what actions will and will not be tolerated must exist—even if the agreement is not universal across members of a society and is therefore to some extent imposed. Indeed, even 'official' definitions of violence are characterized by heterogeneity. Still, an examination of these definitions reveals some consensual threads.

In Western society, the more commonly shared conceptualizations of violence are reflected in several standard definitions provided by Webster's Dictionary (1992: 1086):

> 1 The quality or state of being violent; intensity; fury; also, an instance of violent action. 2 Violent or unjust exercise of power; injury; outrage; desecration; profanation. 3 Law Physical force unlawfully exercised; an act tending to intimidate or overawe by causing apprehension of bodily injury. 4 The perversion or distortion of the meaning of a text, word, or the like; unjustified alteration of wording.

In further illustration of the heterogeneous content of definitions of violence, Webster's Dictionary (1992: 1086) lists several synonyms for violence including:

> Acuteness, boisterousness, eagerness, fierceness, force, fury, impetuosity, injury, intensity, outrage, passion, poignancy, rage, severity, sharpness, vehemence, violation, wildness, wrath.

Another definition is offered by Kruttschnitt (1994: 294) who describes violence as, "behaviour that threatens, attempts, or actually inflicts physical harm." With regard to violence against women in the military community, Harrison (2000) argues that in order to capture the nature of this type of violence, the definition must include not only physical abuse, but psychological abuse and economic vulnerability as well. Some definitions even consider unintentional acts of physical force to be violent—for example, a *violent* storm. Finally, some define violence in terms of a distinction between the use of legitimate force, and illegitimate force—the later of which is said to constitute violence (Nettler 1978).

Adding to the variation in how violence is conceptualized, there are many different types and classifications of violence. Fawcett, Featherstone, Hearn and Toft (1996: 1) state:

> violence also takes many forms: physical, sexual, emotional, verbal, representational, cognitive. It includes men's violence to women and children, violence between men and women, women's violence to children and men, and indeed children's violence to each other and to adults. Violence can be directly from one person to another and can be between people; it can be interpersonal or institutional, local or global, between known others or between strangers. It is a clearly multifaceted set of actions and activities.

Other examples of types or classifications of violence include domestic violence, collective violence, terrorism, police violence, prison violence, school violence and gang-related violence.

Of particular interest to the present study is the fact that situational circumstances associated with violent encounters influence the meaning attached to the use of physical force (Kennedy and Forde 1999). For example, the social definition of the situation may depend on whether the incident occurs in a private versus a public setting, as well as the relationship between the parties and whether or not bystanders are present. If a violent encounter occurs within the privacy of a household, between people who know each other, it may be defined by the parties involved (and sometimes others) as a 'private' matter. However, if the same incident occurs in a public setting between strangers, the event may be defined and therefore reacted to as a violent crime—especially if there are bystanders present who involve themselves in the defining and reaction process.

Another example, one that is also of particular relevance to the current study, relates to the effects of gender with regard to definitions and perceptions of violence. Brownstein (2000: 99) contends that "violence by women not only has received less attention, historically it has been stigmatized as humorous or supercilious in the context of society dominated by men." On the other hand, violence *towards* women, especially *by* men, is generally viewed as much more serious than violence by men towards other men. Thus, gender—and gender-dynamic—are critical to understanding how we interpret and define what violence is, and what kinds of violence will be tolerated.

In general, two important observations can be made with regard to definitions of violence. First, there is diversity in terms of how violence is defined and the scope of activities that are included. Consequently, it is necessary to look beyond physical behaviour to determine the meaning of an act as violent or nonviolent. Second, a differentiation is generally made between 'unjust' or 'unlawful' uses of force and other 'legitimate' manifestations of force, based on factors such as characteristics of the target (for example, gender and age) and the reasons for using violence in a particular social context. This commonly made distinction reveals the fact that we determine the meaning of violence in relation to a number of person and situation factors, thus highlighting the relevance and significance of the situational level of analysis for the purposes of interpreting action and understanding how violence is defined. Overall, the examination of how violence is defined and the circumstances within which it may be considered legitimate is important, because these factors may be related to the actual use of violence.

Having said all of this, Brownstein (2000: 6) says that when we examine definitions of violence "it is possible to conclude that violence refers to something that involves social activity; the threat, attempt, or use of physical force, and the intent of gaining dominance over another or others." More specifically, in Western society violence is generally defined in terms of some form of 'illegitimate' physical action or force, or threat of physical action or force, intending or actually causing harm. This is particularly the case for legal definitions of violence. For example, assault and sexual assault each have three different levels of seriousness in Canada, and these levels are defined in terms of the amount of physical harm experienced by the victim (Rodrigues 1993).

In the current study violence has been operationalized as the *willingness* of males and females to use physical force as a means for dealing with social conflict (Kennedy and Forde 1999). The operationalization of violence in this manner raises two important issues that must be taken into account when examining the results of this research. First, this study does not examine actual violent behaviour. Instead, as will be discussed, respondents are asked to report whether or not they believe they would be willing to use physical force in a number of hypothetical conflict scenarios. Second, the use of physical force in these scenarios does not necessarily entail *criminal* violence. For example, in some scenarios the use of force may be interpreted as a method of self-defence rather than as a crime. Given that the objective of this study is to determine the circumstances within which respondents will legitimize the use of force as a means for dealing with conflict, this definition is considered sufficient for the present research.

Given that the question of 'what violence is' has now been addressed, an official portrait of violence is presented for the purpose of more clearly defining the nature of this social problem in Canada.

The Problem of Violence in Canada

Based on legally defined categories of crime, official crime statistics represent the most commonly relied upon source of information with regard to crime rates and trends. In Canada, legal categories of violence include "homicide, attempted murder, assault, sexual assault, other sexual offences, abduction and robbery" (Tremblay 1999: 5). Using these legal definitions, violence is quantified and measured in terms of violent crime statistics.

After nine years of steadily falling crime rates in Canada, crime actually increased slightly during 2001 (+1%) (Savoie 2002). To place the present crime rate within an historical context, police-reported crime rates for 2001 were approximately the same as rates reported in 1979 (Savoie 2002). At the same time though, the crime rate is now 46% higher than thirty years ago (Savoie 2002). The overall rate of violent crime also increased slightly in 2001 (+1%) for the second year in a row (Savoie 2002). Small increases were noted in the categories of assault and sexual assault, although the rates for robbery and homicide remained relatively stable and a decrease was seen in the category of attempted murder (Savoie 2002). Overall, Savoie (2002: 5) reports that "the 2001 violent crime rate is 6% less than a decade ago, but 52% higher than 20 years ago." Interestingly however, if common assaults are excluded, the violent crime rate would be 28% lower than a decade ago (Savoie 2002).

In terms of types of crime, of all reported crime incidents in 2001, "13% were violent crimes, 52% were property crimes and the remaining 35% were other offences such as mischief, disturbing the peace, prostitution and arson" (Savoie 2002: 1). Thus, violent offences represent a relatively small proportion of all police-reported crime. Of the violent crime that occurs in Canada, homicides and attempted murders together constitute less than .5% of reported violent incidents, (homicides include first and second-degree murder, manslaughter, and infanticide) (Savoie 2002). While the rate of homicide in Canada has remained relatively stable for the past three years, the rate had been decreasing since the mid-1970's and is now about the same as the rate experienced during the later 1960's (Savoie 2002). The most prevalent type of violent crime is common assault, which accounted for 62.6% of all violent crime in Canada during the year 2001 (Savoie 2002).

With regard to victim-offender relationships, Canadians often fear strangers when in actuality we are much more likely to be victimized by someone we know. Based on UCR data Besserer and Trainor (2000: 10) report that "26% of violent crime victims knew the perpetrator to be a family member and 38%, an acquaintance. For 30% of victims, the perpetrator was a stranger." In terms of specific crime types, "the majority of sexual assaults were committed by a friend/acquaintance/other, nearly half of assaults were committed by a family member, but the majority of robberies were committed by a stranger" (Besserer and Trainor 2000: 10). With regard to homicide "in 2001 87% of solved homicides were committed by an acquaintance or a family member, while the remaining 13% were committed by a stranger" (Dauvergne 2002: 1). Common assault exemplifies this point as well. In 1999, 75% of reported assaults involved an accused that was not a stranger to the victim (Besserer and Trainor 2000: 21).

It is important to recognize that these statistics regarding the relationship between parties involved in violence are not very surprising. These numbers reflect the fact that we are more likely to socially interact with people who are known to us than we are with strangers. As a result, it is more probable that we will experience conflict and possibly violence with those who are closer to us. Nevertheless, if an individual spends a great deal of time in public places and therefore has a higher rate of interaction with strangers, their likelihood of a violent encounter with a stranger is increased. On the whole, the content of violence and processes related to violent situations vary across circumstance and context, and while violence between people who know each other is more common than violence between strangers, people still do experience conflict and sometimes violence with individuals that they do not know. Consequently, this is an important area for investigation as well.

In addition to patterns of violence associated with relationships, there is one correlate of violence that is even more salient in the research and that is gender. Official crime statistics reveal that males engage in violence, as well as other types of serious offending, more often than females (Savoie 2002). In 2001, males were charged with 86% of the total number of homicides in Canada, while females were charged with the remaining 14% (Savoie 2002). Females were further charged with 12% of attempted murder offences, 17% of assaults and 9% of robberies (Savoie 2002). In total, females accounted for 16% of those charged with violent offences in Canada during 2001. Females were also charged with 23% of property crimes (Savoie 2002). Altogether, females accounted for 18% of *Criminal Code* charges (Savoie 2002). Thus, while there are variations in gender differences by crime type, for most crimes males are much more heavily involved than females and this trend has remained relatively stable over time (Boritch 1996). Interestingly, rather than pursuing the question as to why females commit so little crime relative to males, many of those who study crime have used official crime statistics as a justification for not devoting a great deal of energy to the study of female offenders.

In their entirety, official crime statistics provide an indication of the general trends associated with violence. First, statistics show that until recently, the crime rate, including violent crime, had been slowly decreasing and only a slight increase was experienced in 2001 (Savoie 2002). Second, relative to all types of violence, a strong majority of this activity in Canada can be characterized as less serious violence that occurs between individuals who are known to one another. And third, males are much more likely than females to be involved in violence either as a perpetrator or as a victim (Harris 1991; Marvell and Moody 1999; Campbell and Muncer 1998; Felson 2000; Silverman and Kennedy 1987).

Although some significant general conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of crime statistics, a primary limitation associated with these statistics is that they cannot tell us much about the specific characteristics of violent situations themselves. Moreover, though official statistics reveal enduring gender differences in rates of violence, we have a very poor understanding as to when, where, and why these differences—and possibly similarities—exist. Official statistics leave certain questions unanswered. For example, what kinds of situations might lead a female to use violence against a stranger? All told, this discussion demonstrates that gender is a strong correlate of violence, one that demands much greater theoretical and empirical attention.

To better understand who is most likely to be involved in violence and under what circumstances violence is most likely to occur, there is a need to concentrate more on learning about everyday social interactions that pose the potential for conflict and perhaps violence. People experience conflict during the course of their daily lives, yet only a very small percentage of conflicts ever escalate to the point of violence. Thus, while conflict is a part of everyday life, violence is not. As a result, violence must be understood as being only one of many possible outcomes of conflict situations. It is argued here that the investigation of this social problem requires an integrated form of analysis to which criminological endeavors have traditionally not dedicated much attention. Moreover, gender needs to play a much more pivotal role in the study of violence.

Traditional Approaches to the Study of Violence

The early classical school of criminology focused on law and social control, while the positivist school concentrated on motivation. In fact, the early classical school has been criticized for neglecting motivation. At the same time, the positivist school has been criticized for placing too narrow a focus on motivation. Nevertheless, during the late 19th century, and for the greater portion of the 20th century, positivism has by far been the dominating influence in studies of crime, including violence. Furthermore, it can be argued that this dominance has lead to a preoccupation with the dispositional characteristics of individuals (the individual level of analysis), and to a lesser extent environmental factors that are external to the individual (the macro level of analysis) as the causes of criminal behaviour (Clarke 1981). This has resulted in a neglect of analyses at the micro level of situation.

For the purposes of this research, the micro or situational level of analysis is defined in terms of "those factors, outside the individual…that influence the initiation, unfolding, or outcome of a violent event" (Sampson and Lauritsen 1994: 30). Unfortunately, isolated emphasis on the individual or macro level of analysis has lead to a more narrow understanding of the processes associated with crime and violence because analyses at the level of situations, as well as attempts at theoretical and analytical integration involving the analysis of situations, are not facilitated. Indeed, Clarke (1981: 295) states that "with some exceptions, criminological theories have been little concerned with situational determinants of crime." Still, it is indisputable that positivist studies involving macro and individual level analyses of crime, including violent crime, have made extensive contributions to the field of criminology. These important contributions are discussed below.

The Individual versus Structure

Influenced by the dominance of positivism, two primary positions have driven the investigation of violence within the field of criminology—an individual-based position and a macro-structural position. As evidence of this, Sampson and Lauritsen (1994: 1) state that most research since 1945 has "been descriptive and focused either on individual-level correlates of violent offending or, to a much lesser extent, community level correlates of violence rates." In terms of the latter tradition, the objective has been to explore the broader social conditions thought to contribute to crime and violence.

The macro-social level of analysis involves the examination of "what it is about community structures and cultures that produces differential rates of crime" (Sampson and Lauritsen 1994: 2). This level of analysis attempts to determine whether rates of violence are related to the characteristics of the people who live in a particular community, or to properties of the community itself. For example, Miethe and Meier (1994: 2) state that "macro-structural theories of crime emphasize how high crime rates are a consequence of economic inequality, unemployment, anomie, population mobility, heterogeneity and weak institutional control." Thus, "the goal of macro-level research is not to explain individual involvement in criminal behaviour but to isolate characteristics of communities, cities, or societies" (Sampson and Lauritsen 1994: 3). Examples of this type of research include subcultural perspectives, social disorganization theory and strain theories. A discussion of Merton's theory of anomie will help illustrate the macro tradition in criminology.

Merton's anomie theory is a macro or structural theory of crime in that it locates pathology within the social structure of society itself (Merton 1938). More specifically, Merton suggests that when a society places a greater emphasis on culturally prescribed success goals than the availability of institutionalized means for achieving those goals, anomie is the result. Deviance, including violence, then represents an adaptation to the experience of anomie (Merton 1938). From this social structural approach, anomie theory focuses on explaining differentiation in rates of deviance across different social groups, in particular those who have greater access to legitimate means versus those who do not. For example, this theoretical perspective has been offered as an explanation for the concentration of crime in lower-class urban areas (Akers 1994).

Importantly, research directed by macro theoretical perspectives such as Merton's anomie theory have produced empirical support that speaks to the influence of a variety of structural factors in relation to crime and violence (Miethe and Meier 1994). Certainly the primary contribution of macro level analyses has been a greater awareness of the wider social context of crime and violence. At the same time however, anomie theory is not intended to explain why a particular individual may or may not engage in criminal or violent behaviour, nor can this theory explain how anomie is manifested within the context of micro level situations. Thus, anomie theory and macro level theoretical perspectives in general cannot help to determine the more specific situational factors related to violent encounters.

A similar limitation is associated with research that concentrates on the individual level of analysis. While there is a certain lack of consensus with regard to how multilevel factors should be delimited, the individual level of analysis is typically defined in terms of "characteristics of individuals that explain behaviour" (Sampson and Lauritsen 1994: 2). Individual level variables for analysis can include demographic characteristics such as age, gender, race, marital status, socioeconomic status, as well as a variety of social or lifestyle factors and dispositional characteristics (Sampson and Lauritsen 1994).

It is clear that individuals differ in terms of demographic and social characteristics. Moreover, these factors are important to analyze because studies have demonstrated that individuals characterized by a particular association of demographic and social characteristics have a greater tendency to be involved in crime and violence

(Hindelang, Gottfredson and Garofalo 1978). For example, young, impoverished, single males who live in socially disorganized inner-city, neighbourhoods in the United States are more likely to experience violence than older, wealthy, married females from a suburban neighbourhood in the same country. Notwithstanding these relationships, it should also be quite obvious that not all individuals who fall into the higher risk demographic categories are violent, and even those who are do not resort to violence in every situation. Consequently, it is necessary to look beyond these immediate social characteristics.

In addition to demographics, the individual level of analysis can involve an examination of individuals' dispositions. Dispositional research concentrates on biological and psychological characteristics, with the objective of determining what *causes* particular individuals to be violent (Wilson and Herrnstein 1985). The implication of this type of research is that some individuals have an inherent predisposition for violent behaviour. For example, biological approaches suggest that individuals may "respond differently to certain types of stimuli, thus resulting in behavioural differences" (Sagrestano et al. 1998: 288). Likewise, some individuals suffer from mental disorders that may in certain situations contribute to their potential for using violence. Other important psychological factors include hyperactivity and a variety of personality disorders that may influence the way someone interprets and responds to particular situations (Hawkins, Herrenkohl, Farrington, Brewer, Catalano, and Harachi 1998).

Indeed, there is plain evidence to support the fact that humans differ in terms of their biological and psychological makeup, and it is practical to assume that dispositional characteristics can influence behaviour, including violent behaviour—although the exact nature of the link is not always clear (Hare 1993). Personality theories provide an interesting example of the positivist concern with determining the causes of crime. Essentially these theories assume that individuals who engage in crime "have abnormal, inadequate, or specifically criminal personalities or personality traits that differentiate them from law-abiding people" (Akers 1994: 86). For example, offenders are sometimes diagnosed as psychopaths or sociopaths who are said to have such 'deviant' traits.

As with other perspectives that focus on the individual, however, the problem with this type of a diagnosis is that while we may be able to determine that such individuals have a greater risk of becoming involved in violence, we cannot predict this outcome with a great degree of specificity. Moreover, if we concentrate only on diagnosing and attempting to 'cure' personality disorders, we fail to acknowledge the fact that not even psychopaths are deviant in all types of situations (Hare 1993). Thus, to better understand the link between personality disorders and crime, we must examine the situational contexts within which such individuals are most likely to engage in criminal or deviant behaviour including violence.

In general, an exclusive focus on the individual level of analysis invites serious limitations with regard to the research questions that can be developed and answered. In particular, this empirical standpoint can lead to more narrow presumptions regarding the social processes related to violence. For example, by focusing on factors inherent to the individual, this level of analysis has contributed to conceptualizations of violent behaviour as primarily impulsive and/or reactionary, and therefore as something that is difficult to anticipate. While it is true that individual level analyses can help us to learn why some individuals are more likely than others to behave violently, this type of analysis cannot assist in determining the situational circumstances under which these individuals are most likely to behave this way.

Whether or not a particular individual—male or female—resorts to violence will depend very much upon the circumstances that characterize a particular social interaction. While it is commonly assumed that person characteristics may predispose certain types of behaviour, the exact nature of this relationship is not clear. As suggested, even those individuals who we think may have a predisposition for violence are not violent all of the time. Clarke (1981: 296) states, "it is worth pointing out that even the most persistently criminal people are probably law-abiding for most of their potentially available time." To further illustrate, in terms of attitudes towards violence, those who indicate that they would approve of violent behaviour under some circumstances do not necessarily approve of violence in all situations.

Overall, while individual level analyses are clearly important to understanding human nature, as well as to knowing more about what individuals bring to situations of social interaction, our ongoing affair with this type of research has thwarted our efforts to explore situational approaches (Miethe and Meier 1994; Clarke 1981). As a result of narrowing our investigations to research agendas developed within the confines of individual level analyses, we have acquired a more circumscribed knowledge of violent behaviour. Significantly, it is at the situational level of social interaction that individual person characteristics merge together with situational factors to produce a final behavioural outcome. Thus, by focusing on the individual level of analysis the potential combined and interactive effects of individual level person characteristics and situational level factors are overlooked.

For these reasons, while there is great value in researching both macro structural conditions and individual level factors, when examined in isolation these two approaches have in common their mutual neglect of the micro-situational level of analysis (Sampson and Lauritsen 1994). While violence represents the actions of particular individuals living within a particular macro structural environment, violent behaviour, like all other behaviour, takes place within a micro social context. Thus, in order to fully comprehend why violence occurs, there is a need to conduct analyses at the level of situation as well. As illustrated by the above discussion however, a byproduct of the positivist dominance within the field of criminology has been a greater focus on individual and macro level analyses to the neglect of situational level analyses and models which integrate the individual and situational levels of analysis.

It was not until the late 1970's and early 1980's that the field of criminology witnessed an emergent interest in situational analysis and more integrated approaches to the explanation of crime (e.g., Luckenbill 1977). Contemporary criminologists have made attempts to bring together consideration of offender characteristics, victim characteristics, and the social context of criminal interactions. As a result, greater theoretical attention has been given to factors such as the influence of victim behaviour and the significance of opportunity for explaining crime. Still, only recently have criminologists begun to make a serious effort to engage in situational analyses and to empirically test more integrated models of crime.

Significantly, while criminologists have neglected situational level analyses, as well as integrated models that bring together individual and situational factors, social psychologists have long debated the relative importance of person factors, situation factors, and person-situation interactions for explaining human behaviour (Malloy and Kenny 1986). Given the relevance of this debate to the current research objectives, this study will draw on the social psychological literature as a means for integrating the analysis of person effects, situation effects, and person-situation interaction effects related to violence. Notably, as will be seen in this study, this approach further allows for a more complete investigation of the effects of gender in relation to violence.

The Person-Situation Debate In Social Psychology

Pervin (1981: 40) argues that psychology is faced with two distinct research problems, "the emphasis on variation due to situation (treatment) differences as opposed to the emphasis on variation due to person (individual) differences." In fact, the importance of both person and situation factors has been recognized and documented since as early as 1936 when Lewin argued that "behaviour is a function of both the person and the environment" (Malloy and Kenny 1986: 202). According to Ross and Nisbett (1991: 9), Lewin maintained that "social context creates potent forces producing or constraining behaviour." Nevertheless, not unlike criminologists, until more recently psychologists have devoted the majority of their attention to the study of individual variation in behaviour (Magnusson 1981; Endler 1981; Campbell 1986).

Similar to the field of criminology, it was not until the late 1970's and early 1980's that there was a significant resurgence in concern with the "person versus situation" issue in the study of personality by psychologists (Price and Bouffard 1981;

Pervin 1981). In part, this renewed interest resulted from evidence being brought forth that questioned the "transituational consistency of personality" (Price and Bouffard 1981: 27; see also Furnham and Argyle 1981). According to Price and Bouffard (1981) studies began to show that situational factors, as well as the effects of interactions between person and situation factors were important sources of variance (see also Epstein 1979). To provide a general portrait of the person-situation debate, each of the major positions within this debate—the trait position, the situationist position and the interactionist position—will be discussed in brief.

The Trait Position

Epstein (1979: 1097) argues that "a critical issue in personality theory is whether stable behavioural dispositions exist." The argument of a pure trait position theorist is that "behaviour is a function of the person, personality or traits" (Buss 1981: 228). Traits have been defined as "the prime or basic personality constructs or variables and are the major determinants of behaviour" (Endler 1981; see also Buss 1981). The primary assumption of trait theories is that personality is stable and that this stability should be consistent across situations (Endler 1981; Malloy and Kenny 1986).

Critics argue however that "there is little empirical evidence to support the trait theorists regarding transituational response consistencies" (Endler 1981: 236; see also Campbell 1986). Indeed, Endler (1981) asserts that the complexity of personality stretches far beyond deterministic traits. He states:

> the trait (consistency) versus the situational (specificity) controversy is a complex and important issue for the area of personality. Although no one would deny the presence of personality stability and continuity…there is persuasive evidence…to suggest that there are both cross-situational personality differences at any given time for a particular individual, and substantial longitudinal personality changes over time (Endler 1981: 237).

Notwithstanding these criticisms, Epstein (1979) and others contend that the absence of stable personality traits has yet to be proven. Trait theorists and their supporters maintain that stronger measurement procedures would reveal more stability in personality research (Epstein 1979; Pervin 1986). For example, these theorists argue that personality is related to the situations that people end up in; consequently, measurement strategies that place people within artificial situations cannot detect these effects (Epstein 1979; see also Furnham and Argyle 1981).[1]

At the same time however, evidence that the behaviour of individuals varies across situations has by no means been discounted. In fact, Epstein (1979: 1099) acknowledges that studies have found "that variance attributable to individual differences is usually much smaller than the variance attributable to situations and to the interaction of individuals and situations." Moreover, Epstein (1979: 1122) makes clear that

> the conclusion that there are relatively broad, stable response dispositions, or traits does not conflict with the assumption that situations often exert a strong influence on behaviour. People obviously do not manifest response dispositions independent of setting.

Consequently, the power of the situation cannot be ignored.

The Situationist Position

According to Endler (1981: 236)

> sociologists and social psychologists…have proclaimed that *situations* are the prime determinants of behavioural variance…and many of these theorists have focused on the situations and the meanings these situations have for individuals in terms of cultural rules and roles.

The claim of a pure situationist position is that "behaviour is a function of the environment" (Buss 1981: 228). More specifically, situationists argue that human behaviour is a response to stimuli, and consequently "there is little stability in personality, as behaviour is determined almost exclusively by situational variables" (Epstein 1979: 1099; Buss 1981). Situationists base this assertion on research that finds low correlations of behaviour across situations. The objective of the situationist position then, is to identify consistencies in behaviour in relation to the dimensions of social situations (Malloy and Kenny 1986).

In critiquing the situationist position, Epstein (1979: 1102) contends that

> the view that there are traits consisting of relatively broad, stable behavioural dispositions does not require the assumption that situations do not affect behaviour. Behaviour can vary significantly with situations, and there can still be an underlying consistent thread in behaviour averaged over situations.

On a similar note, Campbell (1986: 7) points out that "while situations are powerful, they do not expect that they will exert their effect uniformly across persons. Individual differences will exist and it remains a challenge for situationalists to explain them." In other words, while situational factors are critical, they are clearly not the sole determinant of behaviour.

Given the above discussion, it appears that the best conclusion that can be drawn at this point is that both individual traits and situations are important to the explanation of human behaviour. Accordingly, it is argued here that neither a pure trait position nor a pure situationist position is appropriate as a starting point for investigating the complexity of violent behaviour. The difficulty for researchers however, lies in explicating the exact nature of the relationship between individual traits and situational factors. In contrast to a pure trait or situationist position, the interactionist position recognizes the significance of both person and situation factors as well as the interaction effects among these variables.

The Interactionist Position

According to Magnusson (1981: 96) "knowledge of the interaction between individual and situation is essential to an adequate description and understanding of behaviour." Epstein (1979: 1102) agrees, stating that

> since behaviour never takes place in a vacuum but always occurs in a situational context, it is meaningless to talk about characteristics of an individual's behaviour without specifying the situation in which the behaviour occurs.

Endler (1981) takes this a step further and argues that it is inappropriate to try and determine the amount of variance that can be attributed to either person or situation characteristics. Instead, this researcher maintains that the most logical question to pose is "*How do individual differences and situations interact in evoking behaviour*" (Endler 1981: 241). This is the question that is addressed by the interactionist position.

Epstein (1979: 1101) describes the interactionist position as follows:

> according to the interactionist position, the question of which is more important, the situation or the person, is a meaningless one, as behaviour is always a joint function of the person and the situation. In its applicability to the issue of stable individual differences, the interaction position can be viewed as a compromise between the trait position and the situationist position, for it acknowledges the existence of behavioural stability, but only within situational constraints.

Thus, the interactionist position recognizes the importance of personality within the context of situational influences (Pervin 1986). Moreover, consistencies in behaviour may indeed be discovered when behaviour is examined across a number of like situations.

Magnusson and Ekehammar (1981: 181) argue that the situation can affect behaviour in two primary ways:

> (1) by providing, within each situation, a continuous stream of stimuli, some of which are selected by the individual and attended to as cues for his behaviour, and (2) by providing, as a whole, a frame of reference for the choice of cues to attend to and for the interpretation of these cues.

In other words, the situation can provide both specific cues as well as general contextual effects for the behaviour of an individual. What differentiates the interactionist position from a situationist position however, is that the effects of situations can be influenced by the characteristics—including personality traits—of the individuals involved. Individual characteristics can be seen to inform the interpretation of social situations and influence the recognition and relevance of particular behavioural cues; thus, "the same situation may have different meanings for different individuals" (Magnusson and Ekehammar 1981: 176). This means that person and situation factors come together to produce behaviour. Moreover, Ross and Nisbett (1991: 158) argue that

> when person factors and situation factors interact in a powerful enough fashion, the result may be a degree of continuity in social behaviour and a degree of predictability of social outcomes that is sufficiently striking to challenge any situationists who are too simple-minded in their faith.

Finally, in reference to the interactionist position in psychology, Birkbeck and LaFree (1993: 130) state that "their importance lies in the attempt to conceptualize personality in terms of the individual's mode of interaction with situations; they treat the individual as a situational actor." Overall, while it may be less theoretically complex and empirically more simple to study either individual factors such as personality traits, or situational factors, the research to date suggests that human behaviour is the product of a mixture of these factors. Consequently, to examine one set of factors in isolation from the other will necessarily reduce the amount of variance that can be explained.

Summarizing the Person-Situation Debate

The debate among trait theorists, situationists, and supporters of the interactionist position continues each maintaining that their own position represents the most logical way in which to study human behaviour. In actuality however, the relative importance of person, situation or person-situation interactions will to some extent depend on the phenomenon being studied. Epstein (1979) argues that in some cases behaviour is more reflective of the situation, while in other cases personality is more important. In other words, there are situations in which a number of individuals would behave similarly, while in other situations behaviour may vary dramatically across individuals.

In studying the use of violence for example, in the case where one individual physically attacks another, the majority of 'victims' will defend themselves, either by fighting back or by attempting to flee the immediate situation. Very few individuals will simply allow another to physically harm them if they are able to fight back or flee. In such a case, the characteristics of the situation may be seen to be more powerful than the characteristics of the individuals involved. In contrast, in a less intense situation where one individual verbally insults another, for example, some 'victims' will choose to walk away while others may be inclined to respond with violence (Toch 1986). Hence, in this case, individual characteristics may play a greater role in influencing the interaction because the situation poses fewer constraints on the options available to the 'victim'.

On a more general level, in summarizing the person-situation debate Epstein (1979) submits that each of the trait, situationist and interactionist positions actually addresses a different type of research question. According to Epstein (1979: 1104):

> the interactionist wishes to study the behaviour of people with certain attributes in situations with certain attributes. The trait theorist wishes to study consistent behavioural tendencies in individuals over a sample of situations. The situationist is concerned with the general effects of situations over a sample of individuals.

Malloy and Kenny (1986) agree with this point and argue that each of these positions focuses on a particular "determinant of behaviour." Consequently, it appears that the strongest approach for studying human behaviour depends upon the specific objectives of the researcher (Epstein 1979).

In terms of the present study, the research objectives are most clearly aligned with the interactionist position—"to study behaviour of people with certain attributes in situations with certain attributes" (Epstein 1979: 1104). As a result, the current research will examine violence from a general interactionist position, whereby person factors, situation factors, and interactions among these factors will be investigated. Prior to engaging in such an investigation however, it is first necessary to clarify the definition of 'interaction' within the context of the research objectives of this study.

Defining the 'Interaction' Component in Interactionism

Arguably, "interactionism" has been used to try and resolve the person-situation debate (Buss 1981). However, in discussing the interaction between persons and situations, it has been pointed out that many researchers fail to adequately define what they mean by *interaction* (Buss 1981). Furnham and Argyle (1981: 221) argue that there are two primary meanings associated with the term 'interaction':

> the earlier use referred to *statistical interaction*, in analysis of variance designs, between the effects of personality and situational variables. The other sense is of *dynamic interaction* between persons and situations wherein persons select and alter situations, and situations influence persons. This is seen as an "organic" and two-way process. Interactions in analysis of variance are not relevant to dynamic interaction.

Buss (1981) agrees with this distinction and states that for the first type of interaction, *statistical interaction*, the objective is to determine which factors (person, situation or their interaction) account for the greatest portion of the variance in behaviour (Buss 1981). In this case, 'interaction' refers to a "nonreciprocal relationship between environmental and person variables" (Buss 1981: 229). In contrast, for the second type of interaction, *dynamic interaction*, it is assumed that "the relationship between environmental and person variables is one of *reciprocal* or bi-directional causation" (Buss 1981: 229). In other words, the relationship between person and situation is more complex in that person factors can influence the situation and in turn, the behaviour of individuals is at least in part a response to immediate situational factors.

For the purposes of this research, the term interaction refers to statistical interactions between independent variables rather than between independent and dependent variables. However, the independent variables in this study include both person and situation factors, making it possible to examine the statistical interactions between these person and situation factors in terms of their effects on the dependent variable of aggression.[2] Thus, while this research does not examine the reciprocal relationship between independent and dependent variables, statistical interactions between particular person and situational variables (such as the gender of the respondent and the gender of the target) are examined.

Person, Situation and the Study of Violence

It should be clear from the above discussion that in many cases human behaviour cannot be explained by person or situation variables alone. Nevertheless, until more recently, the trend in the social sciences, including criminology, has been to focus on the individual and to neglect interaction effects between person and situation variables. As a result, Pervin (1981: 41) explains that "we know little about the dimensions people use to perceive and organize situations or about the process of person-situation interactions." Pervin (1986: 18) adds that: "Cronbach in 1957 and again in 1975 had to sound a plea for an emphasis on complex person-situation interactions. Undoubtedly, the same plea might still be sounded today."

With regard to the study of violence, Gibbs (1986: 107) states that: "an obvious but important point is that violence is not equally distributed among person-situation combinations." Yet, the overwhelming tendency has been to conceptualize violence in terms of person characteristics. For example, Campbell (1986b: 115) argues that

> not only have we largely failed to see it as a process rather than an outcome, but we have also fallen into the belief, common in criminology, that "bad" outcomes must have "bad" causes—so we continue to search for the predictors of aggression in static intrapersonal attributes such as under-controlled hostility or defective ego strength.

In other words, the focus has been on the characteristics of individuals to the neglect of social processes associated with violence. Moreover, these person characteristics are generally interpreted as static in nature rather than malleable to situational factors.

Perhaps the best way to demonstrate the relevance of both person and situation variables to the study of violence is to begin by making a distinction between *criminality* and *crime* (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990). Hirschi and Gottfredson (1986) suggest that *crime* should be defined in terms of events, while *criminality* relates to an individual's propensity to engage in criminal behaviour. This distinction is important, because while an individual may have the propensity to commit crime, the opportunity to act on such propensities is to some extent an emergent property of situations. To illustrate, Birkbeck and LaFree (1993: 114) say, "criminality is a necessary but not sufficient condition for crime to occur, because crime requires situational inducements in the form of motivation and opportunity." Thus, human behaviour, including criminal and violent behaviour, is the end product of combined and sometimes interactive effects of individual person characteristics and situational factors.

As pointed out however, more often than not the focus of criminological theory has been on the causes of criminality rather than on criminality as one element of crime. The consequence of this is that we have been left with an underdeveloped explanation of action. Cornish (1993: 372) suggests that "this lack of attention to the contemporary context of action leaves a gap between criminality and crime that excludes and neglects a host of important issues." According to Cornish (1993), a concentration on criminality, or individual propensity for criminal behaviour means overlooking the fact that individuals have behavioural options within the context of situations. Even in situations where individuals feel that they are left with few alternatives, or where circumstances do not permit a thorough exercise in decision-making, at the very least human actions are influenced to varying degrees by situational factors. Overall, by placing emphasis on criminality alone, we disregard the power of situation.

Certainly, some researchers have argued that criminologists have spent too much time debating whether crime or criminality should be the primary focus of study (Barlow 1991). In contrast, Birkbeck and LaFree (1993) say that theories of crime which focus on situations should be brought together with theories of criminality which focus on the enduring propensities of individuals. Likewise, despite the traditional tendency to focus on either crime or criminality, Carter (1991: 526) supports the need for integration, stating that:

> analyses combining individual and contextual (social structural or situational) variables bridge the micro and macro levels of analysis... they provide a concrete means for connecting an individual's attitudes, sentiments, and behaviour, on the one hand, with the influences of social settings and groups on such attitudes, sentiments, and behaviour, on the other.

Thus, it does appear that appeals for the importance of situation, as well as person-situation interactions, are beginning to have an impact (Clarke 1981). Birkbeck and LaFree (1993: 118) contend that today, rather than focusing on traits or situations, we are moving more in the direction of an interactionist perspective "that views behaviour as a function of both the person and the situation."

Violence occurs in many different types of situations, distinguished by a number of dimensions including domain, (e.g., the household and leisure); the relationship between the participants; the gender and age of the participants; the presence of bystanders or witnesses; the level of intensity; and the source of the conflict. Consequently, it is important to examine situations in terms of dimensions that may facilitate violence. At the same time however, Toch (1985) makes the important point that even in cases where violence is lawful in the name of self-defence, it is not *required*. Instead, Toch (1985) believes that to varying degrees, situations behave as 'catalysts' for violent behaviour. While Toch (1985) agrees that some situations leave little room for a non-violent response, he argues that when an individual has pre-existing traits that predispose him or her to violent behaviour, very little may be required of the situation to bring about a violent response. In other words, according to Toch (1985) situations are the catalysts for pre-existing behavioural repertoires. As a result, there is a need to understand how a certain conjunction of situational factors and individual level person characteristics can ultimately combine or interact to produce a violent outcome.

It has been demonstrated here that person and situation factors can be studied simultaneously through the adoption of an interactionist position in the study of violence. Significantly, the interactionist position is appropriate for directing the primary objective of this study—to identify the characteristics of individuals who are most likely to use violence as a means for resolving conflict and the circumstances under which violence is most likely to be interpreted as an option. Moreover, the interactionist position provides an innovative approach for investigating the specific effects of gender in the social processes associated with violence. Interestingly, Moskowitz (1993: 387) comments that "gender differences are a class of individual difference variables that have not historically been included in the discussion of Person X Situation interactions." Thus, the current study will move beyond past research of this kind by making gender a central ingredient in the study of violence.

Gender and Violence

Gender is arguably the most salient variable in criminology, yet at the same time, it is one of the least understood. Messerschmidt (1993: 1) states that "gender has consistently been advanced by criminologists as the strongest predictor of criminal involvement." Shaw (1995) adds that women commit a small proportion of offences and an even smaller proportion of violent offences in Canada. The official crime statistics discussed in this chapter support these observations. Clearly there is evidence of a strong association between gender and violence; nevertheless we have a poor understanding as to exactly when, where, and why such differences exist (Kruttschnitt 1994). Moreover, potential gender similarities in violent behaviour have been greatly neglected. It has been argued that in general "more exploration is needed about the patterns and correlates of female violence" (Kruttschnitt 1994: 336). For example, we know little about interactions that involve females using violence against strangers—male or female strangers.

Little is known about female violence, and therefore, gender and violence, because, females have often been excluded from criminological theory and research. Belknap (1996) points out that criminological theories generally focus on the etiology, or causes of crime,,and that this focus has been accompanied by an emphasis on male youth. Despite the conspicuity of gender, until recently, females have rarely been included in criminological research samples. As a result, some theorists argue that theories may explain male behavior rather than criminal behavior (Belknap 1996). Moreover, this suggests that much of traditional criminological research does not directly address gender differences—or possible similarities in criminal behaviour. Indeed, Messerschmidt (1993: 2) argues that "the well-known conventional criminological theories are glaringly unable to account for the gendered nature of crime."

Steffensmeier and Allan (1996: 466) note that "the traditional theories are helpful in explaining overall patterns of female and male offending, and they shed some light on why female levels of offending are lower than for males." Nevertheless, for the most part, these theories have failed to explain more serious female crime. Moreover, the deficiencies associated with traditional approaches to the study of gender and violence have ultimately resulted in a general misrepresentation of the female violent offender. More specifically, the tendency has been to focus on women either as 'fallen', or as helpless victims (Shaw 1995). First, with regard to the idea of the fallen woman, Shaw (1995: 120) states that "our image of violence is based on that of male violence—macho, tough, aggressive...we have no way of conceptualizing violence by women except in terms of its 'unnaturalness'." Second, with reference to women as helpless victims, Shaw (1995: 120) argues that "women are seen to be victims of their circumstances, lacking independence and status, subject to control at the hands of their partners and a patriarchal society." This is consequential, because by focusing on violence against women and portraying women as victims, we oversimplify the problem of female violence. This unsophisticated construction of the female violent offender does not facilitate an adequate investigation of their behavior or the situations within which this behavior occurs.

Overall, while it is recognized that males are more likely to be involved in violence than females, we do not yet fully understand why this is the case, or whether or not this pattern persists across different types of situations. For example, it could be that women are simply less involved in violence than men; however, it could also that females are less likely to be involved in public, more visible forms of violence. Our lack of understanding in this area is a reflection of the fact that studies designed to better locate the effects of gender in relation to violence through the examination of both individual and situational level characteristics, as well as the interactions among these factors, have been practically non-existent.

To address this gap in the research, the current study includes gender as a central variable in the investigation of the combined and interaction effects of individual level and situational level variables relating to violent encounters. Ideally, a study of violence and gender could include analyses at the individual, micro-situational and macro-structural levels; however, available data rarely permit such an analysis (Sampson and Lauritsen 1994). This is the case for the current study in that these data do not allow for analyses at the macro-structural level—hence the focus on individual characteristics and situational factors. The major research questions to be addressed in this study are outlined below.

Major Research Questions

In view of the purpose of this investigation outlined above, this study will address several major research questions. First, what are some of the primary individual level variables related to violence? For example, to what extent are personality factors such as low self-control related to violent behaviour? In addition, do cognitive variables such as an individuals' attitudes towards violence influence their willingness—or lack there of—to use violence in situations of interpersonal conflict? Second, what are some of the primary situational factors related to the use of violence during the context of an interpersonal dispute? For example, does the likelihood of a violent response vary in terms of the intensity of the situation? Do males and females respond differentially to male versus female combatants? Third, what combination of individual and situational factors is most likely to result in a violent response to interpersonal conflict? In addition, are there any significant interaction effects among these variables—first between situational variables, and second, between person and situational factors? For example, are situations involving a male combatant interpreted as more intense? For another example, is there an interaction between the gender of the respondent, the gender of the combatant and the presence of bystanders in terms of the likelihood of a violent response? Fourth and finally, as revealed in some of the examples above, this study explores the overall effects of gender in relation to the major research questions. In particular, this research will test for potential interactions between gender and the key variables included in this study.

All of these important questions can only be addressed by simultaneously examining both person and situation factors as they relate to the willingness of both males and females to use violence across a number of different sets of circumstances.

Contributions of the Current Research

Given the limitations associated with much of the existing research relating to gender and violence, the present study will add to previous research, including that of Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999) and Forde and Kennedy (1997) in several important ways. First, this research will contribute to the growing literature on individual factors relating to the propensity for the use of violence in conflict situations. Second, this study will contribute to the currently limited body of research relating to situational factors that may channel or constrain individual propensity in conflict situations—factors that can facilitate or deter a violent response. Third, the adoption of an interactionist position allows for the investigation of combined and interaction effects between individual and situational level variables in an integrated model as they relate to violence. With regard to the study of violence this type of research has not often been attempted.[3] In fact, interaction effects tend to be neglected in a great deal of criminological research more generally (Aiken and West 1991).

Finally, the current study makes gender central to the analysis of violent situations. As has been discussed, while opinions abound, criminological theory has not yet been able to adequately explain violent situations, let alone the more specific effects of gender in these situations. Clearly there is a multitude of studies related to violence; nevertheless, most have been conducted in a manner that does not include gender as an integral part of their initial conceptualization. In contrast, gender plays a critical role in both the development and analysis of the research questions in this study. As a result, this research will extend our comprehension of the more specific effects of gender with regard to violence. In sum, this study will contribute to the way we understand the social processes associated with the use of violence and in particular, how we understand the relationship between gender and violence. It is hoped that this research will serve to advance the development of more effective methods for confronting this social problem.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter Two will develop the theoretical aspects of this study, while Chapter Three will detail the methodological issues. Chapter Four will present the results of the analyses, and finally, Chapter Five will discuss the conclusions drawn from this research.

CHAPTER TWO: Studying People, Situations and Violence

Introduction

Chapter One discussed social definitions of violence, the extent of the problem of violence in Canada, and traditional approaches to the study of violence. A dispositional bias in criminology and in the social sciences more generally has been established (Clarke 1981). In addition, the neglect of situational analyses, as well as a general disregard for the importance of gender in relation to violence has been revealed. At the same time, it has been argued that both person and situation factors are important for understanding violence, and therefore, neither can be overlooked. Thus, as has been explained, the objective of this research is to borrow the interactionist position discussed in the social psychological literature to investigate person factors, situation factors and their interactions, in terms of their capacity to explain violence. In doing so, the present study draws on relevant theoretical achievements in the study of violence—both at the person and situation levels. This chapter will highlight important past theoretical contributions as well as introduce the wider theoretical framework to be used in this study. The specific person and situational variables to be included in the model will also be introduced.

Person Factors and Violence

The history of the study of crime and violence can generally be characterized as the study of 'why people do bad things'. In an effort to determine what makes people do bad things, researchers have investigated everything from the shape and size of one's skull, to physical body type, chromosomal disorders, hormonal imbalances, intelligence, an over-indulgence in one's love for their mother, and mental disorders (Curran and

Renzetti 1994). The relationship between personality and crime has been another area of great interest. For example, an individual might be diagnosed as a psychopath or a sociopath (Hare 1993). Clearly though, one of the most significant factors associated with violence is gender; nevertheless, until more recently researchers have frequently neglected this variable. A review of the existing literature relating to gender and violence illustrates this fact.

Gender

Messerschmidt (1993, 1997) contends that the tendency within criminology has been to ignore gender and that the majority of research in this field can be criticized for being gender-blind. Kruttschnitt (1994: 324) adds "sociological and criminological theories offer virtually no explanation for the representative lack of female involvement in crimes of violence" (see also Messerschmidt 1993). In part, the scarcity of theoretical knowledge with regard to female crime, and therefore the effects of gender on crime, can be attributed to the fact that criminological research has concentrated on male subjects (Belknap 1996). To illustrate, Chesney-Lind (1989: 6) states that "the academic study of delinquent behaviour has, for all intents and purposes, been the study of male delinquency." Despite the obvious significance of gender then, until recently, females have rarely been included in criminological research samples.

The result of this neglect in traditional criminological research is that we have a weak understanding of the relationship between gender and crime and this includes violence. Moreover, the questions we ask about gender, or whether we ask these questions at all, reflect how we define gender, and it is clear that definitions have changed over time. A brief evaluation of these past definitions of gender reveals how they have influenced the study of gender and crime and the limitations associated with some of these perspectives.

Early Biological and Psychological Theories

For pioneering criminologists, the gender question did not attract a great deal of serious academic attention.[4] It was argued that females committed so little crime, and in particular violent crime, that they were hardly worth the energy of inquiry. Moreover, observed gender differences could be explained away by 'common knowledge' of the essential biological and psychological differences between males and females (Pollack 1950). Thus, earlier studies that did consider gender were dominated by sex-based assumptions reflecting then current conceptualizations of gender.

Guided by the popularity of positivism, the late 19th and early 20th centuries were characterized by a dominance of biological and psychological explanations for both male and female crime. However, by the 1950's, many criminologists had become disenchanted with these approaches and began to explore theories of crime that were sociological in nature (Boritch 1996). For instance, it was at about this time that we witnessed the emergence of control theories and subcultural theories. What is curious though, is that while sociological models were enthusiastically adopted to study males, the few investigations of female crime continued to be influenced by biological and psychological perspectives that placed emphasis on the inherent inferiority of girls and women (Boritch 1996). More specifically, Boritch (1996: 50) states that theories of female crime "focused on women's inherent biological inferiority and on behavioural, psychological, and sexual differences between women and men." To illustrate, Pollack argued that "women were more sly and deceitful than men, more passive and passionless, basing their crimes on sexual motivation, unlike male crime which they say is economically motivated" (Gwynn 1993: 96). Thus, even though Lombrosian ideas had been discredited by many criminologists, sex-based assumptions continued to influence the perception of female offenders (Boritch 1996).

Biological and psychological approaches that emphasize sex differences between males and females assume that these differences are natural and immutable, and that sex differences are largely responsible for differences in behaviour (West and Zimmerman 1987). In other words, sex differences are offered as the *explanation*, rather than as a tool for analysis. A primary consequence of this kind of research and the conjectures it embraces has been the tendency to pathologize female crime more so than male crime. Even today there is a tendency to suggest that female crime is inherently different from that of her male counterparts—for example, that her crimes are emotional while his are instrumental (Shaw 1995; Ben-David 1993). Not coincidentally it was in the wake of widespread dissatisfaction with so-called 'malestream' theories of crime and social policy that feminist approaches to the study of crime and criminality emerged during the late 1960's, and the early 1970's (Boritch 1996).

Feminism and the Study of Crime and Criminality

Influenced by the women's movement and feminism more generally, early feminist criminologists assembled to critique the gender-blindness of mainstream criminology and challenge the sex-based assumptions that accompanied the study and social treatment of female offenders (Shaw 1995; Daly and Chesney-Lind 1988; Boritch 1996). In contrast to traditional conceptualizations, feminist criminologists offered a social and historical construction of gender. Accordingly, feminists have argued that gender differences in crime are associated with the social aspects of gender rather than being directly attributable to biological sex differences. Notwithstanding, the major theories in criminology have continued to either neglect females or to explain their behaviour differently from that of males.

Violence and other deviant behaviours have traditionally been studied primarily from macro or individual standpoints. In relation to gender, traditional macro theories of *crime*, such as Merton's strain theory, have essentially been gender-neutral and they have been criticized for this. For example, Messerschmidt (1993: 2) asserts that Merton's anomie theory is "clearly inadequate for understanding the high gender-ratio and gendered character of crime." According to Messerschmidt (1993), women have the same goals as men but have less economic opportunities; consequently, he argues that based on Merton's theory females should actually commit more crime than males.

In contrast to macro theories of crime, individual-focused theories of *criminality* have traditionally been gender-specific whereby the focus is either on females or males alone, and the common assumption is that female violence needs to be explained differently from male violence (Steffensmeier and Allan 1996). Unfortunately, gender-specific investigations have lead to gender-specific explanations of violence often characterized by *a priori* sex-based assumptions about the nature of differences between males and females. A primary consequence of gender-specific approaches is that they do not afford the flexibility required to account for the prospect of finding similarities in the social experiences of males and females. Moreover, explanations rooted in assumptions about immutable sex differences cannot account for within-gender variation at the level of situation. Overall, the research to date has not been able to predict the circumstances in which gender differences and similarities should occur. Critically, Boritch (1996: 75) states that

> by failing to address the marked differences between men and women, criminological theories were unable to explain women's relative noncriminality or conformity. Moreover, by failing to explain female crime, these theories were deprived of crucial insights into male criminality.

In view of these observations, it is argued that criminologists have not explained female crime or gender differences in crime very well. As a consequence of this, feminists have put forth several of their own theories to help explain female offending and gender differences in crime (Boritch 1996; Kruttschnitt 1993).

The Liberation Thesis

The liberation thesis is one of the most discussed perspectives on female crime. Freda Adler (1975) and Rita Simon (1975) both argue that social circumstances rather than biology are the source of gender differences in crime. These researchers suggest that the women's movement resulted in changes to gender roles, which in turn can be linked to the changes in female crime patterns since the 1960's (Boritch 1996). In relation to the current study, the most critical limitation associated with the liberation thesis, however, is that it is unable to explain how macro social changes with regard to gender roles and gender relations are manifested at the level of the individual or at the level of situation.

Role Theory

Another example of a feminist approach to explaining female crime is role theory. Role theory refers to the conceptualization of gender in terms of "sex roles" or "gender roles" (West and Zimmerman 1987). Essentially, this theory says that the differential personality traits of males and females result largely from socialization, and that these traits result in a differential tendency for females to conform and for males to deviate. Unfortunately, the problem with this theory is that "the notion of roles has taken on the same inevitable mandatory character of sex differences that had been promoted in biologically-based determinism" (Smart (1976) cited in Boritch 1996: 69). Thus, role theory ultimately reduces gender to the existence of a polarized dichotomy of the 'male sex role' and the 'female sex role' (Messerschmidt 1993). The consequential implication of explaining behaviour in terms of static sex roles is that gender similarities in behaviour, including the use of violence, cannot be adequately explained. Role theory is unable to account for the fact that social action varies within gender and across situations—not just between males and females.

Reconceptualizing Gender as Situational

In contrast to biological or role-based conceptualizations of gender, West and Zimmerman (1987) submit that gender is a product of social situations. They define gender as "the activity of managing situated conduct in light of normative conceptions of attitudes and activities appropriate for one's sex category" (West and Zimmerman 1987: 127). According to these researchers, gender is something that is *done*, rather than something that *is*. Moreover, the *doing* of gender is situational (West and Fenstermaker 1995). This means that the effects of gender on behaviour will reflect the immediate circumstances of the situation at hand.

In contrast to the less dynamic interpretation of gender as a "role", if gender is interpreted as normative—something that is socially constructed—and therefore variable across different types of situations, we can better understand the relationship between gender and behaviour. Consequently, the social constructionist conceptualization of gender helps reconcile empirical findings that males and females are more similar than different on most traits and abilities, with the observation that they sometimes behave quite differently. Perhaps most importantly though, this perspective allows us to recognize that there are situations where males and females behave similarly—notwithstanding their basic *sex differences*.

Summary of Gender and Crime Literature

This brief review of past perspectives on gender and crime shows that gender has been studied primarily in terms of sex or sex role differences (although the work of West and Zimmerman (1987) demonstrates a move away from this trend). In addition, paralleling traditional criminological research more generally, analyses of gender and crime have occurred primarily at the individual level of analysis and at the macro level of analysis. The result has been a neglect of analyses at the level of situation as well as a failure to capture interactions among the various levels of analysis. Moreover, research has either been gender-neutral or gender-specific and therefore, unable to more precisely specify the effects of gender in relation to crime.

This discussion demonstrates that previous research on gender and violence has resulted in an underdeveloped explanation of this relationship, as well as an oversimplification of female violence more generally. Research strategies to date have not facilitated an adequate investigation of the nature of female violent behaviour or the variety of situations within which this behaviour occurs. For example, Kruttschnitt (1994: 351) states that "in the aggregate…although women do appear to be less violent than men, it may be that in specific supportive contexts where violence is encouraged or viewed as appropriate, women's levels of violence equal those of men."

Thus, what is needed is an approach that allows for variability in the effects of gender across the many circumstances that characterize violent situations. To accomplish this objective, it is necessary to avoid the crime versus criminality, or person versus situation dichotomy, in favor of a model that includes both person and situation factors simultaneously. With the assistance of the interactionist position, which facilitates an examination of person and situation characteristics, as well as their statistical interactions, this study will examine the effects of gender in conjunction with situational factors as well as other person characteristics. This approach represents an important move away from traditional approaches to the study of gender and violence.

Without doubt, for more than a decade the most discussed and tested theory in relation to the individual level of analysis within the field of criminology has been the general theory of crime introduced by Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990). Consequently, Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) concept of self-control will be examined as an important person factor that may contribute to the use of violence in situations of conflict.

The General Theory of Crime

Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) theory of self-control has quickly become a popular, although somewhat controversial theory for distinguishing those individuals who engage in criminal and deviant behaviour from those who do not. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990: 232) contend that "criminality (low self-control) is a unitary phenomenon that absorbs its causes such that it becomes, for all intents and purposes, *the* individual-level cause of crime" (italics original). While these authors may be overstating the power of self-control, empirical tests of the general theory have revealed support for self-control as a variable for explaining crime and analogous acts (Pratt and Cullen 2000).

For Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) criminality is synonymous with self-control, and the concept of self-control represents the first key independent variable in the general theory of crime. According to Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990: 90) "people who lack self-control will tend to be impulsive, insensitive, physical (as opposed to mental), risk-taking, short-sighted and nonverbal." In addition, these individuals are said to have a temper relating to their low tolerance for frustration. As distinguished from crime, criminality refers to the propensity to engage in crime as well as those "certain other kinds of irresponsible behaviour, which are not necessarily crimes" (Grasmick et al. 1993: 8).

In terms of explaining the causes of low self-control, while socialization is a continuous process that occurs throughout life, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) focus on early childhood and contend that low self-control is the product of ineffective socialization during the first years of life. Moreover, self-control is said to remain stable throughout the life course. At the same time however, something that is not stable throughout life is opportunity—the second key independent variable in the general theory of crime (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990).

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) argue that low self-control does not *require* crime. Instead, low self-control must come together with opportunity, which they define as the circumstances within which crime or analogous acts are most likely to occur. According to this theory, in the presence of opportunity, individuals with high self-control will be much less likely to engage in crime and analogous acts than individuals with low self-control. In contrast, those with low self-control will be inclined to pursue their own self-interests without great concern for the potential consequences (Arneklev et al. 1993; Akers 1991).

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) argue that the general theory should not be aligned with traditional, positivist-oriented personality theories—the general theory does not suggest that low self-control "pushes" or propels people into criminal and deviant behaviour (Arneklev et al. 1993). Rather, high self-control behaves as a restraining force where opportunities for crime exist. Thus, self-control can be seen as a personality factor that influences decision-making, and is therefore better associated with the tradition of the classical school of criminology (Arneklev et al. 1993; see also Brownfield and Sorenson 1993). Significantly, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990: 89) also state that low self-control "can be counteracted by situational conditions or other properties of the individual." Unfortunately though, these researchers fail to elaborate as to what some of these conditions and properties might be.

Tests of the General Theory

Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) theory of self-control has been put to the test by several researchers. As a result, the general empirical status of this theory has been extensively reviewed elsewhere and will not be discussed here (see Grasmick et al. 1993; Arneklev et al. 1993; Brownfield and Sorenson 1993; Keane, Maxim and Teevan 1993; Nagin and Paternoster 1993; Piquero and Tibbetts 1996; Forde and Kennedy 1997; Evans, Cullen, Burton, Dunaway and Benson 1997; Piquero and Rosay 1997; Burton, Cullen, Evans, Alarid and Dunaway 1998; LaGrange and Silverman 1999; Sellers 1999; Nakhaie et al. 2000; Pratt and Cullen 2000; Piquero, MacIntosh and Hickman 2000; and

Moffitt, Krueger, Caspi and Fagan 2000). Significantly though, in an overall review of the general theory, Pratt and Cullen (2000: 931) found that "regardless of measurement differences, low self-control is an important predictor of crime and of analogous behaviours."

Given that the effects of gender in relation to the use of violence are of central interest to this research, it is important to point out that several studies have also examined the more specific area of gender and self-control. Significantly, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) believe that their general theory can account for variation in crime across gender (as well as age, race and ethnicity).[5] In contrast to what we might expect to find based on the arguments of Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), studies that have examined gender and self-control have found that gender continues to be a significant variable in the explanation of crime and analogous behaviors (Burton et al. 1998; LaGrange and Silverman 1999; Nakhaie et al. 2000). For example, LaGrange and Silverman (1999) tested the general theory for its capacity to explain gender differences in juvenile delinquency. Their results demonstrate partial support for the general theory in that self-control, opportunity and their interactions explained some of the variance; however, gender remained a significant predictor in the model (LaGrange and Silverman 1999).

Burton et al. (1998) also tested the general theory and found 'qualified support' for its generalizability to males and females (see also Keane et al. 1993). Significantly, based on the results of their study, these authors argue that "research on Gottfredson and Hirschi's perspective cannot afford to ignore, as it largely has thus far, gender" (Burton et al. 1998: 138). However, they also state that "scholars interested in gender and crime cannot afford to ignore the general theory" (Burton et al. 1998: 138).

Summary of the General Theory

In summary, empirical tests of the general theory of crime, including those that focus on the relationship between self-control and gender, have revealed varying levels of support for the work of Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990). Nonetheless, the general theory of crime has also been criticized on a number of grounds. In particular, the assertion that stable, enduring individual differences in propensity exist, continues to be a subject of controversy. At the same time though, in addition to situational factors, Nagin and Paternoster (1993: 489) argue "that criminological theory must include stable individual differences in propensity to offend as a central construct." Thus, there is a need to analyze both individual and situational factors.

It is the intention of this study to contribute to the literature on self-control by investigating some of the "situational conditions or other properties of the individual" thought to counter the effects of low self-control (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990: 89). A selection of these other 'properties of the individual' that may influence the occurrence of violence in situations will now be examined. A discussion of the importance of situational factors will follow.

Age

Research on age and crime has demonstrated the significance of this demographic variable in terms of its relationship with violence and other crime (Hirschi and Gottfredson 1983). In general, young people have been found to be involved in more violence than older people (Markowitz and Felson 1998). In addition however, Felson, Baccaglini, and Gmelch (1986) suggest that the effects of age may be related to the situational aspects of a particular violent incident. Felson et al. (1986: 163-64) found for example, that

> youths are more likely to fight when they are with other youths than when they are among older persons. This is consistent with previous research, which suggests that third party incidents of homicide and assault involving youth are more likely to be supportive of violence and are likely to induce more intense violence.

Thus, to better understand the relationship between age and crime, the effects of age should be examined in conjunction with other important person and situation factors.

Attitudes Towards Violence

Social psychologists have argued that in terms of studying the interaction between person and situation "the most useful person variables are cognitive ones, such as category systems, expectancies of outcomes, and values" (Furnham and Argyle 1981: 221-222).[6] Vernberg et al. (1999: 386) suggest that "from a social-cognitive perspective, attitudes and beliefs reflect one aspect of *knowledge structures*, which are believed to guide individual differences in social information processing." In other words, attitudes towards violence can influence how someone interprets "social cues, access aggressive responses more readily, or anticipate positive outcomes from aggression" (Vernberg et al. 1999: 386-87). Attitudes can thus be said to reflect a predisposition to behave in a particular manner (Baron, Kennedy & Forde 2001; Markowitz and Felson 1998). As evidence of this, Vernberg et al. (1999) found a strong relationship between attitudes towards violence and aggressive behaviour towards peers.

Studies have also examined the relationship between gender and attitudes in relation to violence. Specifically, this research has found that males are both more supportive of violent attitudes and more likely to engage in violent behaviour (Vernberg et al. 1999; Harris 1991). Further, there is research to suggest that attitudes towards violence may vary not only in accordance with the gender of the perpetrator, but also by the gender of the victim and by the gender-dynamic of the interaction (Koski and Mangold 1988; Felson 2000). Harris (1991: 182) reports for example, that "sex of victim is a major factor in evaluating an act of aggression." For another example, Felson (2000: 91-92) argues that

> violence against women is antinormative or deviant behaviour, and that it violates a special norm protecting women (NPW). That norm discourages would-be attackers and encourages third parties to intervene on behalf of women who are under attack.

Felson (2000: 92) adds that "the NPW apparently protects females from females as well as males...however, there may also be a special rule forbidding male violence against females" (see also Felson 2002; Harris 1991).

Overall, social ideals of the appropriateness of violence are thought to influence behaviour and these ideals appear to be related to gender. This is an important observation because within the context of social conflict, such normative attitudes can have an influence on the behaviour of all participants including perpetrators, victims and bystanders.

Fear of Crime

Fear of crime may represent another important factor in relation to use of violence in situations of conflict. An individual's level of fear may influence the way that person responds to situations of conflict that have the potential to escalate into violence.[7] It is important to note also that fear of crime is greater among some demographic categories of the population than others (Smith and Torstensson 1997). For example, Weinrath and

Gartrell (1996: 190) found that "females were considerably more fearful of walking alone in their neighborhoods at night, and older respondents reported more apprehension." Thus, certain groups may have a greater level of fear, which in turn may influence how they perceive a particular conflict situation and therefore the likelihood of using force as a response. In addition to fear of crime, actual victimization experiences may be an important factor influencing future behavioural responses.

Past Victimization Experiences

Like attitudes towards violence and fear of crime, past experiences with victimization may have an impact on the way individuals respond to situations that have the potential to escalate to the point of violence (Kennedy and Forde 1999).[8] Weinrath and Gartrell (1996: 187) reveal that "the actual experience of crime is usually assumed to heighten victims' perception of vulnerability" (although they also state that the research findings have been mixed with regard to this issue). Feelings of vulnerability relating to past experiences with victimization may then have an influence on the way people react to future situations of conflict.

Summary of Person Factors

In sum, gender, self-control, age, attitudes towards violence, fear of crime and past experiences with victimization are all expected to be variables of significance with regard to the individual level of analysis and violence. Each of these variables represents an element that individuals bring with them to situations of social conflict; and consequently, each of these variables may influence the progression of social conflict. At the same time though, the relative contribution of each of these individual level variables will be influenced by situational factors as well.

Situational Factors and Violence

Sutherland suggested the significance of 'situation' for understanding crime during the 1940's; however, as discussed, traditional criminological research, including the work of Sutherland, has been dominated by studies with a dispositional orientation (LaFree and Birkbeck 1991). Cornish (1993: 371) contends that

> even though the contribution of situational inducements and opportunities to involvement in offending has long been recognized...attempts to integrate situational factors into accounts of criminal involvement are still unusual.

It was not until the late 1970's and early 1980's that criminologists embarked on a new trend involving a consideration of the relationship between situational factors and violence (Luckenbill 1977; Felson and Steadman 1983). Recently, we have further witnessed the initiation and development of more integrated approaches to criminological theory, which include an examination of the characteristics of offenders, characteristics of victims, and the social context surrounding the interaction of parties involved in violent events (Felson 2000). But, as Kennedy and Forde (1996) point out, although integrated approaches have been discussed theoretically, empirical testing of these approaches has been more limited.

The desirability of situational approaches relates to their capacity to "underscore the "factorial complexity"...of real counts of criminal acts and to focus greater attention on offender decision-making" (Birkbeck and LaFree 1993: 132). Sommers and Baskin (1993: 137) add that situational studies are valuable because they focus on specific types of crime such as violence, they take note of factors such as the relationship between the conflicting parties, and they have more practical implications for crime control policy than do dispositional oriented studies. All told, LaFree and Birkbeck (1991) disagree with those who say that situation is unimportant and instead praise its significance for understanding criminal behaviour.

LaFree and Birkbeck (1991) assert that to analytically explore the situational aspects of crime we first need to define the concept of situation. Next we need to create a theoretical model which can explain how social actors interact with situational variables and how their behaviour is a product of this interaction. Finally, we need to conduct empirical research regarding this relationship. In accordance with these provisions, this chapter will define situation and situational analysis as well as present a theoretical framework for the analysis of violent situations. The later chapters will address the empirical obligation.

Defining and Operationalizing Situation

'Situation' is defined in general terms as "the immediate setting in which behaviour occurs" (Birkbeck and LaFree 1993: 115). More specifically, as revealed in Chapter One, the micro level of situation refers to "those factors, outside the individual…that influence the initiation, unfolding, or outcome of a violent event" (Sampson and Lauritsen 1994: 30). It is argued that in addition to person characteristics situational factors vary in such a way as to influence the likelihood of violent crime. In other words, violent outcomes should be clustered around certain types of situations—hence the need to study the characteristics of situations.

Birkbeck and LaFree (1993: 120) argue however, that situations actually consist of two primary elements: "the objective fact of situations and their subjective definition by actors." Thus, in addition to examining factors 'outside the individual', researchers cannot neglect person factors, such as personality characteristics and attitudes towards violence, because they can influence "the processes by which actors subjectively interpret situations" (Birkbeck and LaFree 1993: 120). Research suggests that a particular set of objective circumstances does not always result in the same outcome—situations are not determinant (Sommers and Baskin 1993). Instead, the personal characteristics of individuals can influence the types of situations they choose too participate in as well as their behaviour within those situations. As a result, the micro-situational level of analysis should involve an examination of the effects of 'objective' situational factors, as well as the 'subjective' interpretation of those factors by individuals. However, Birkbeck and LaFree (1993: 115) point out that the "precise definition and operationalization of the situation are difficult, partly because of the need to include the actor's subjective representation of the setting…but mainly because of the causal complexity." For the purpose of the current research, the primary goal is to define and operationalize situations in a manner that makes them comparable to other situations.

To facilitate comparison, operationalization involves the specification and examination of a set of objective situational factors as well as variables of interest thought to influence the subjective interpretation of situations (Steffensmeier and Allen 1996). Objective situational factors for analysis can include setting, the relationship between the parties, gender of the combatant, and the presence of bystanders. The measurement of how a person subjectively interprets situational factors, however, is more challenging because this relates to how individuals attach meaning to the context of situations. While it was impossible in the current study to question individual respondents in terms of what the various situations in the analysis mean to them, information about respondent characteristics can help us to better understand how certain groups of individuals interpret various situations. For example, males as a group may interpret and respond to situations differently than females as a group. Similarly, individuals who report a greater tolerance for violence may respond to situations differently from those with a lower tolerance for violence.

Situational Analysis Defined

Given their definition of situation, Birkbeck and LaFree (1993: 116) broadly define situational analysis as "the search for regularities in relationships between behaviour and situations." Further, they define the locus of situational analysis as "the crime-producing effects of physical and social stimuli captured by individuals from the immediate setting" (Birkbeck and LaFree 1993: 129). Important situational factors that can influence behaviour include the gender and age of the target, the intensity of the situation and whether or not bystanders are present.

Gender of Harm Doer

In a study of homicide, Felson and Messner (1996) found that both males and females perceive a greater threat from other males; consequently, they suggest that for tactical reasons, both males and females should be more likely to harm a male opponent (see also Jurik and Winn 1990). In addition, Smith, Martin and Kerwin (2001: 170) report that "studies have generally shown that male aggression toward females is low, relative to male-male aggression" (see also Felson 2000). Smith et al. (2001: 170) add that, "this target gender effect is typically attributed to participants' awareness that male aggression against females is not socially acceptable."

Likewise, Felson (2000) argues that females should be less likely targets of violence due the existence of normative inhibitors against such behaviour. At the same time however, Felson (2000) suggests that such normative inhibitions may be eradicated to an extent when it is a female that makes the initial attack. Nevertheless, given the assumption that females are perceived as less of a threat, in general, male combatants should be more likely to be the subjects of escalating routine conflict, and aggression.

Age of Harm Doer

As with the age of the respondent, age of the harm doer may also have an effect on whether or not violence results from situations of conflict (Kennedy and Forde 1999). More specifically, younger opponents may be perceived as a greater threat than older opponents in these situations. Overall, depending on the characteristics of the respondent and of the situation, the age of the harm doer may serve to escalate or de-escalate the process of routine conflict.

Intensity

Kennedy and Forde (1999) examined the effects of intensity in their study of routine conflict and found that level of intensity was significantly related to whether or not respondents would be willing to use physical force in the hypothetical scenarios presented to them. One way to interpret the effects of intensity is to view this factor as an increasing level of provocation or threat—a low intensity situation should be less provoking and/or less threatening than a high intensity situation. Significantly, there is research to suggest that provocation is an important predictor of aggression for both males and females (Hoaken and Phil 2000). From another perspective, the intensity of situations of social conflict should be related to how upset individuals become in these situations, which should in turn influence how they respond.

Bystanders

The presence of bystanders can play a significant role in the processes associated with routine conflict. Bystanders may themselves engage in physical or verbal attacks, they may serve to instigate the conflict by encouraging an antagonist to fight, or they may try to mediate the conflict (Luckenbill 1977; Felson and Steadman 1983). Indeed, Gibbs (1986: 146) observes that "the actions by audiences in disputes have been found to be important in the escalation of violent interactions" (see also Sommers and Baskin 1993).

Significantly, it has been suggested that the effects of the presence of bystanders will depend on the gender-dynamic of the dispute. For example, Felson (2000: 95) says, "survey research shows that the presence of an audience inhibits violence in mixed-gender disputes but encourages violence in conflict between males." In relation to this issue, Berkowitz (1986) suggests that audiences may invite a greater need for the use of violence as "impression management", thus increasing the likelihood of violent retaliation in situations where one social actor is challenged by another (see also Felson and Steadman 1983). This has even been found to be the case for females involved in violent encounters with other females. In one of the few studies that examines women involved in violent crime outside of the domestic domain, Baskin and Sommers (1998: 117) found that, "the presence of third parties appears to increase the perception that violence is legitimate, to increase face-saving concerns, and to increase the probability of retaliation." Thus, even for females violence can be a means for counteracting those who disrespect them or challenge their honor.

In contrast to same-gender interactions, however, it has been found that violence is more likely to be inhibited in the case of opposite-gender incidents that occur in the presence of bystanders (Felson 2000). Moreover, in terms of bystander intervention, research suggests that individuals are more likely to intervene when a male is attacking a female (Laner, Benin, and Ventrone 2001; Eagly and Crowley 1986). Overall, there is evidence of a relationship between the gender-dynamic of disputes and the effects of the presence of bystanders.

Summarizing Situational Analysis

The major premise underlying situational analysis is that the outcome of a situation is not predetermined by the characteristics of individuals or by their personal objectives. Rather, the outcome of any social interaction, including those that turn violent, is at least to some extent forged by the circumstances of the situation itself (Sommers and Baskin 1993). Notwithstanding person characteristics, certain behaviours are more likely to occur in certain types of situations. Situational factors including the gender and age of the harm doer, the intensity of the situation and the presence of bystanders can all influence whether or not violence occurs in association with social conflict. At the same time however, situations do not determine behaviour, rather, person characteristics still influence the ways in which individuals subjectively interpret and therefore adapt to the opportunities and constraints of situational factors.

Ultimately, the primary objective of situational analysis is "the identification of patterns of interaction between individuals and situations in the genesis of decisions to commit crime" (Birkbeck and LaFree 1993: 130). Notably however, Sommers and Baskin (1993) point out that situational analysis can actually occur at two broad levels. The first level relates to "the nature and distribution of criminal opportunities", while the second involves an emphasis on how individual behaviour is influenced by the circumstances of a given situation. These authors say that much of the research has focused on the first level, using opportunity theories to help explain the nature and distribution of situations that might result in criminal violence (Sommers and Baskin 1993). Significantly, these studies have demonstrated that criminal events are not randomly situated across spatial and temporal locations. While these issues will be briefly reviewed here, the focus of the current study is on the second level of analysis—the reaction of individuals to specific situational factors in relation to the use of violence. To illustrate how the present research will extend beyond past theoretical and empirical developments in situational analysis, a discussion of the important contributions of the opportunity perspective, as well as its limitations, is presented.

The Contribution of Opportunity Theories to the Study of Violent Situations

Birkbeck and LaFree (1993: 123) state that "the opportunity perspective in criminology is concerned with the incidence and location of crime events in social systems, and its theories are based on the premise that some situations are more favorable for crime than others." Opportunity theories help us to understand the precursors to violent events by highlighting the fact that crime requires the convergence in time and space of a motivated offender with opportunity (Cohen and Felson 1979). From this theoretical standpoint, opportunity is defined in terms of the presence of a suitable target combined with a lack of capable guardianship (Cohen and Felson 1979). While opportunity theories have primarily concentrated on the explanation of variation in victimization risk, these perspectives have contributed to our understanding of the occurrence of criminal events more generally. The lifestyle-exposure and routine activities theories are the two primary opportunity theories discussed in the criminological research (Miethe, Stafford & Long 1987).

Lifestyle-Exposure Theory

Hindelang et al. (1978) attempt to explain patterns evident in victimization data. Specifically, they want to address the fact that certain groups of people seem to have a greater risk of victimization than other groups of people. To explain this relationship, Hindelang et al. (1978) introduce the concept of 'lifestyle' which can be defined in terms of the ways in which people distribute their activities across space and time.

According to Hindelang et al. (1978), the concept of lifestyle is extremely relevant to victimization risk in that lifestyles influence our options and our constraints with respect to where, when, how and with whom we spend our time. Thus, lifestyles instruct our patterns of association with others as well as direct the activities in which we engage. What is further implied by the lifestyle exposure approach is that victims and offenders tend to share similar characteristics and lifestyles—who becomes a victim depends on who offenders interact with (Fattah 1991).

While the lifestyle concept has made a significant contribution to the explanation of risk for victimization, the manner in which potential victims and offenders come together in time and space to create situational opportunities for crime is better explained by Cohen and Felson's (1979) routine activities theory.

Routine Activities Theory

Cohen and Felson's (1979) routine activity perspective focuses on the circumstances relating to opportunity rather than offender motivation—motivation is assumed. The central thesis of routine activities theory is that crime rates are related to the convergence in space and time of motivated offenders, suitable targets and a lack of capable guardianship (Akers 1994). Moreover, the theory presumes that this convergence is related to the nature of the routine activities of individuals and of society as a whole.

Indeed, the primary argument associated with this theory is that changes in the structure of routine activities have influenced the nature of criminal opportunity (Cohen and Felson 1979). According to Cohen and Felson (1979), routine activities that take people away from their homes and families are related to increases in opportunities for crime. For example, some of the major changes in routine activities during the post WWII era include: more females going to college; an increase in the divorce rate; more married women working; more single person households; and more out of town travel and overseas travelers.

Cohen and Felson (1979) argue then that various macro structural changes have influenced routine activities, which have further influenced the convergence in space and time of motivated offenders with suitable targets in the absence of capable guardians. Significantly, Cohen and Felson (1979: 589) say "that the lack of any one of these elements is sufficient to prevent the successful completion of a direct-contact predatory crime." While criminal acts can be diverse, they all require an offender, a suitable target and the absence of capable guardianship. Cohen and Felson (1979) further maintain that these factors have been neglected by other theories, especially those that focus on criminality, rather than crime. In contrast, the routine activity approach focuses on crime rather than criminality.

Academics such as Birkbeck and LaFree (1991) acknowledge that Cohen and Felson (1979) and other opportunity theorists have developed situational models of crime. Nevertheless, it can be seen that these theories do not extend far enough in terms of examining the context of situations themselves. These perspectives indicate that behaviour is related to opportunity; however, opportunity is to a great extent an emergent property of situations. More recently rational choice theory has attempted to extend the opportunity perspective to consider the role and perceptions of individual offenders in the occurrence of crime (Clarke and Felson 1993).

Rational Choice Theory

> Rational choice theory, like classical theories in general, can be said to
>
> subscribe to a broadly similar voluntaristic, utilitarian action theory in which crime and criminal behaviour are viewed as the outcomes of choices. These, in turn, are influenced by a rational consideration of the efforts, rewards, and costs involved in alternative courses of action (Cornish 1993: 362).

Rather than focusing on motivation *per se*, rational choice theory explains the decision-making process in terms of the determination of opportunities for meeting commonplace needs (Cornish and Clarke 1986). It is suggested that offenders recognize that they will receive benefits from their crimes if they make advantageous decisions about when and where to commit crime and about who or what makes a suitable target.

Clearly then, rational choice theory is present-oriented—the focus is on proximate factors. Rather than predetermined outcomes, Cornish (1993) argues that the offender decision-making process is directed by situational factors (or cues) which inform the offender as to the suitability of various targets as well as the risk and ease associated with a particular action. In terms of opportunity, rational choice theory adds to the lifestyle-exposure and routine activities theories in that it explains how opportunity is maximized through a cost-benefit or risk-reward analysis of situations (Kennedy and Forde 1999).

In contrast to past criminological theories, the rational choice perspective attempts to explain crime as a function of opportunity rather than pathology, as a product of choice rather than impulse, and as a product of situation rather than constitution (Fattah 1993). Rather than searching for factors that 'push' individuals to commit crime, the rational choice perspective suggests that we should examine factors relating to the choices that people make. At the same time however, the idea of bounded-rationality is a central premise of this approach. Sommers and Baskin (1993: 138) say that current research "assumes that individuals seek to maximize utility, but within limits posed by the incompleteness and uncertainty of the information available to them." These authors add that "for behaviour to be rational, it does not have to be carefully preconceived or planned, nor does it require hierarchical, sequential decision making" (Sommers and Baskin 1993: 138). Moreover, offender behaviour can be influenced by a number of factors including time constrictions, the use of drugs and alcohol, and the interference of emotions such as fear and anger. Ultimately the rational choice perspective suggests that decision making can be defined in terms of the choice that is made between a number of *immediately perceived alternatives* which have certain perceived risks and gains attached to them.

Cornish (1993) summarizes the rational choice perspective by saying that while structures are important, individuals act within the context of situations and that it is at this micro level of analysis that theory is most required. Critically, Cornish (1993) argues that all actions of individuals can be understood if we know enough about the situations in which those actions occur. Altogether, behaviour is not predetermined by individual or structural factors; instead, the direction of behaviour may be altered in accordance with the specifics of any given social interaction.

Summary of the Contribution of the Opportunity Perspective

In summary, the opportunity perspective establishes a stronger link between criminality and crime. This perspective says that certain individuals with certain lifestyles will have greater opportunities to involve themselves in certain types of crime. Moreover, these same individual characteristics and lifestyle factors will influence the likelihood of capitalizing on opportunities within the context of specific situations. Thus, lifestyle-exposure theory, routine activities theory, and rational choice theory help us to better understand how individuals arrive in situations that may turn violent, as well as how they make opportunity-related choices.

Notwithstanding this valuable theoretical contribution, Kennedy and Forde (1999) say that on their own, opportunity theories do not explain violent crime very well. Similarly, LaFree and Birkbeck (1991) contend that these theories are too simplistic in terms of their assumptions about the characteristics of crime situations. Consequently, these authors argue that more focus should be placed on how offenders make behavioural choices in conjunction with the circumstances of a particular situation, rather than limiting the research to the characteristics or activities of victims, or the decision-making process more broadly (Birkbeck and LaFree 1993).

Although some theorists characterize violence as unplanned, spontaneous, and expressive, evidence shows that even violent behaviour is influenced by situational factors (Sommers and Baskin 1993). Nevertheless, Sommers and Baskin (1993: 139) argue that "research within the rational choice and opportunity perspectives has ignored the situational dynamics of violent offending." As a result, the current study will move beyond this past research by examining the violent behaviour of individuals within the context of a number of different situational dynamics.

The Current Study: Bridging the Person and the Situation

This broad discussion of the study of persons, situations and violence has highlighted two distinct pathways in criminological theory, one that focuses on "time stable individual differences" and a second that considers "circumstances and situations" relating to crime (Nagin and Paternoster 1993). In relation to individual differences Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) have focused on low self-control as a means for determining individual propensity for crime and analogous acts. In contrast, lifestyles, routine activities, and rational choice theories focus on the role of opportunity in explaining crime. Interestingly, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) have been criticized for failing to develop the opportunity side of their theory, while the opportunity perspective is said to "ignore or attach relatively little importance to notions of enduring individual differences in criminal propensity" (Nagin and Paternoster 1993: 468-69). All told, the first pathway undervalues opportunity, including situational circumstances, while the latter fails to consider initial differences in propensity when considering the impact of situational circumstances.

In view of the limitations of research that focuses on *either* "time sable individual differences" *or* "circumstances and situations", the current study will engage in an integrated analysis of violence that involves an investigation of both individual differences and situations. In contrast to some previous research however, the present study will not examine situation in terms of opportunity at the macro level of routine activities or lifestyles or within the confines of rational choice theory. Instead, the current research will focus on the characteristics of situations, as well as person characteristics and interactions among situation and person factors, with regard to their effects on violence.

To conduct this type of an analysis, it is necessary to have a theoretical framework that is capable of directing and managing a multidimensional investigation. This theoretical model must facilitate a consideration of the personal attributes and attitudes of social actors, situational factors, and potential interaction effects among these variables relating to violence (LaFree and Birkbeck 1991). It is argued here that the routine conflict theory developed by Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999) represents a suitable theoretical framework for the purposes of this study.

Routine Conflict Theory and the Analysis of Person, Situation and Violence

Routine conflict theory aggregates components of social constructionism, the criminal event perspective, and coercion theory, to facilitate an integrated approach to the study of violence (Kennedy and Forde 1996, 1999). Kennedy and Forde (1996: 421) say, "the model of routine conflict suggests that individuals bring to social interaction some expectations about the ways in which they and others will behave in these circumstances." It is hypothesized that these social expectations will influence the behaviour of individuals within situations, and therefore the outcomes of social interactions. Moreover, social expectations, and therefore behaviour, are related to situational factors such as the gender of their target, whether or not other people are present, and the intensity of the situation. In situations of conflict, expectations influence whether or not an individual will respond with physical force or resolve the situation in some other manner (Kennedy and Forde 1999). A more detailed description of the components of routine conflict theory is provided below.

Social Constructionism

Social constructionism represents the structural component of routine conflict theory (Kennedy and Forde 1999). Social construction theory asserts that there are rules for socialization and for the processes through which our definitions of reality are constructed and maintained. Social constructions are defined as "the consensual recognition of the realness and rightness of a constructed reality, plus the socialization by which people acquire this reality" (Atwood 1996: 6). Individuals are born into a society held together by various social constructions and are taught to internalize these meanings and interpretations as their own (Atwood 1996). For example, we socially define violence in terms of what we will and will not tolerate.

Definitions of violence and other phenomena reflect our social values, norms and rules for social interaction and are transmitted through socialization. These definitions then inform the development of "scripts" for behaviour. A script can be defined as "a cognitive structure or framework that, when activated, organizes a person's understanding of typical situations, allowing the person to have expectations and to make conclusions about the potential result of a set of events" (Wilkinson and Fagan 1996: 64). Scripts then, are associated with the "routine cues" of social interactions—various situational factors act as cues that invoke a particular script for behaviour. Significantly, these scripts are constructed in association with person factors such as gender and age as well. For example, Atwood (1996: 9) states, individuals

> learn not only the language that is applied to feelings and events, but also society's expectations for persons of their ages and genders. They learn reciprocal behaviours, attitudes, and postures expected of the opposite sex as well. In this way they learn and prepare to enact the scripts that are deemed appropriate by their culture.

Individuals then bring these socially constructed scripts or expectations with them to situations of social interaction.

To summarize, during a social encounter, situational factors such as the gender of the target and the presence of bystanders will trigger particular scripts for behaviour. In terms of violence there are situations where such behaviour is tolerated, normalized, or even expected by the combatants and/or observers. For example, two males fighting in public may be viewed by some as 'normal' behaviour and may even be encouraged by third parties; however, this is generally not the case for physical fights that take place between a male and a female. In this example, gender acts a situational cue. This means that whether or not a violent script is invoked depends on the cues provided by a particular situation. Ultimately, routine conflict theory says that these scripts will develop into a set of routine responses to various types of situations (Kennedy and Forde 1999). From a criminal event perspective, the second primary component of the routine conflict theory, these socially constructed scripts or routines for behaviour can be viewed as precursors to violence.

The Criminal Event Perspective

The criminal event perspective represents the processual element of routine conflict theory. Clearly there is much more to a violent event than an isolated physical transaction. In fact, we can analyse violence as we would other social events—as a process. Like other social interactions, violent events are not merely random occurrences. Instead, certain individuals, in particular places at particular times, under specific circumstances have a greater likelihood of being victimized or being involved in violent behaviour than do other people in other circumstances (Hindelang et. al. 1978).

Violent situations can be broken down into their precursors, the transaction, and the aftermath of these encounters (Kennedy and Forde 1999). Precursors are defined as factors that precede the transaction or incident in question and contribute to the likelihood of its occurrence. These precursors can include an individual's previous experiences with conflict or violence, personality characteristics, and a subscription to norms or values that legitimize violent behaviour. In addition, situational characteristics such as the relationship between the parties, the setting, and the presence or absence of bystanders can be viewed as precursors that contribute to the initiation of the transaction (Kennedy and Forde 1999).

The transaction refers to the characteristics of a particular social interaction. More specifically, violent transactions involve some form of interaction that likely results in physical harm (Kennedy and Forde 1999). During the transaction phase, a variety of situational factors can influence the processual nature of the interaction. For example, bystanders can play an important role by aiding in the escalation or de-escalation of the conflict, in both passive and active ways.

Finally, the aftermath of the encounter includes an assessment and reaction to the harm done, as well as other consequences of the event (Kennedy and Forde 1999). Depending on the type and nature of the incident, there may be short or long-term consequences for the victim, the offender, and other parties impacted by the event. The victim may suffer physical or emotional harm, the offender may be punished, and bystanders may be injured. Importantly, experiences with crime, including violence, may alter the way individuals perceive and behave in future similar incidents, and therefore modify their behavioural scripts. Overall, examining the aftermath is helpful for improving our understanding of criminal events and therefore how we deal with crime.[9]

Altogether, the criminal event perspective provides a framework for a more in-depth analysis of the elements related to violence. Rather than focusing only on violent offenders or violent outcomes, we can examine precursors in the form of what characteristics individuals bring with them to situations, as well as the situational factors that influence the direction of the social interaction and the aftermath of the event. Hence, this perspective facilitates an integrated analysis of violence. With regard to the transaction phase and explaining the content of violent actions, Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999) draw on coercion theory (also referred to as the social interactionist perspective).

Coercion Theory: The Social Interactionist Perspective

Coercion theory, or the social interactionist perspective, offers an innovative approach to the study of violence because it "emphasizes the role of social interaction—as opposed to conditions inside the person—in aggressive behaviour" (Felson 1993: 104; see also Tedeschi and Felson 1994).[10] This approach can be broken down into four primary components the first of which is the presumption that all harm-doing behaviour is instrumental or goal-oriented (Felson and Tedeschi 1993; Tedeschi and Felson 1994). According to this perspective, violent behaviour is not purely impulsive and reactionary but rather is carried out for the purposes of achieving some objective. Verbal threats and even bodily harm are viewed as a means for achieving a variety of goals including compliance, deterrence, punishment, protecting one's social identity, or gaining retribution (Felson and Tedeschi 1993). For example, parents may spank their children as a form of punishment for poor behaviour, as well as to deter them from behaving similarly in the future. For another example, an adult female may use physical force against another adult female whom she perceives as being a threat to her romantic relationship.

Second and correspondingly, the social interactionist approach challenges the idea that aggression (including physical violence) is the result of sources such as "instincts, hormones, brain centers, thantos, and frustration" (Felson and Tedeschi 1993: 2). Felson and Tedeschi (1993) argue instead that within the context of human relations, physical violence as a form of coercion is one mechanism used to confront conflict. Coercion is defined in terms of an individual(s) being forced to comply with the demands of another or others, or as the imposition of harm. Thus, coercion can manifest itself in the form of threats, bodily force, or some form of punishment where the very intent of the physical act is to do harm (Kennedy and Forde 1999).

The third component of the social interactionist perspective recognizes the crucial role played by "situational and interpersonal factors" in the escalation of conflict to the level of violence (Felson and Tedeschi 1993). Conflict is viewed as a dynamic process that may or may not escalate in to violence depending on the circumstances and the interpretation of the circumstances by the individuals involved (Kennedy and Forde 1995). Thus, the use of coercion is conceptualized as being grounded in the situationally bound process of social interaction (Wilkinson and Fagan 1996). It is argued that an individual is more likely to use coercive methods, including physical violence, where they presume that non-coercive methods are going to be ineffective (Kennedy and Forde 1999).

Finally, the social interactionist perspective "emphasizes the phenomenology of actors, whose values and expectations are important in the evaluations of decision alternatives" (Felson and Tedeschi 1993: 2). For example, individuals who engage in violent behaviour may interpret their actions as justifiable depending on their personal characteristics (such as attitudes towards violence and past experiences with violence), and the circumstances of the conflict. This component reflects the overall concern of the social interactionist perspective with the dynamic process of social interaction and situational factors as they relate to violence.

In summary, social interactionism interprets the content of violent behaviour as instrumental rather than purely impulsive and as a coercive technique rather than a biological instinct. In addition, this perspective recognizes the significance of both situational dynamics and individual values and expectations in relation to violent behaviour. Routine conflict theory merges coercion theory with the ideas of social constructionism and the event-based perspective to explain violence as one possible outcome of a dispute. In order to illustrate how routine conflict can escalate to the point of violence, Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999) borrow from the work of Luckenbill and Doyle (1989) who developed a theoretical model designed to operationalize the evolution of disputes.

Modeling the Evolution of Disputes

Luckenbill (1977) was among the first to examine violence as a process. He argued that homicide is the final outcome of a "character contest" which consists of a series of stages (Luckenbill 1977). Later on, Luckenbill and Doyle (1989) proposed that interpersonal disputes can be operationalized in terms of three broad, successive and interrelated stages (see also Felstiner, Abel and Smart 1980-81). First, one party must place the blame of a negative outcome on another party. In addition, this perceived negative outcome must be transformed into a grievance that requires reparation from the named combatant. This first stage of the dispute process is referred to as *naming*.[11] Next, the grievance must be expressed to the combatant in the form of a demand for reparation. This second stage of the dispute process is referred to as *claiming*, and it is at this stage where a dispute may or may not ensue. If the named combatant rejects the claim made by the wronged individual, the transaction becomes a dispute (Tedeschi and Felson 1994). Finally, if there is a dispute, violence is one of many possible options that may be perceived by any of the involved parties as a means for resolving the conflict. Aggression then constitutes the third and final stage of a dispute. Again, violence is not a necessary outcome of disputes—as stated it is only one of many possible options. Whether or not a dispute escalates to the stage of violence will depend on the individuals involved and the situational circumstances of the conflict.

Summarizing and Application of Routine Conflict Theory

Altogether, routine conflict theory suggests that social situations are governed by rules which are communicated through the process of socialization, and are further developed into scripts for appropriate behaviour (Kennedy and Forde 1999). As individuals socially interact over time they develop scripts, or styles for behaviour that contain these shared social rules and inform expectations for behaviour within a variety of settings (see also Clarke 1981). Routine conflict theory says that social actors enter into situations with previously learned repertoires that provide guidelines or routines for behaviour—including violent behaviour (Kennedy and Forde 1999). As stated by Forgas (1986: 42), "aggressive encounters, just like other forms of human interaction, usually occur in a highly predictable, even ritualized form."

For example, where a male is faced with a situation of conflict, a male combatant may cue or trigger a different course of action than a female combatant, because most males are socialized to believe that it is unacceptable for a male to use physical force against a female. Relatedly however, depending on past observations and experiences, individuals may learn and maintain destructive routines. If an individual has learned that the most effective way to deal with an interpersonal dispute is to use violence, this script may be enacted in future similar situations.

Thus, learned repertoires are said to predispose individuals to behave in a particular fashion such that they influence the perception of behavioural alternatives and constraints in situations (Kennedy and Forde 1999; see also Wilkinson and Fagan 1996). In this manner, routine conflict theory says that individuals develop routines that can include the use of violence. Routine conflict theory further implies that in some situations some individuals will define violence as acceptable or normative. As a result, the routine conflict perspective results in an important shift in focus from violence as a pure psychological state, to understanding violent behaviour as a product of previously learned scripts as well as the circumstances of social interactions that trigger those scripts.

Using this theoretical framework, the current study will address the traditional oversight of analysis at the level of situation, as well as interactions between person characteristics and situational factors in violence research. Rather than focusing on the acts of one individual or on the outcome of a conflict situation, both the characteristics of the parties involved and the circumstances of the situation at hand will be examined together. Additionally, as has been discussed, special attention will be given to the effects of gender in conjunction with the dynamics of violent situations. Relating back to the interactionist position discussed in the social-psychological literature, the central question to be addressed is: *what are the individual and situational factors that come together to influence the social interaction process such that the probability of a violent outcome is increased*?

The Present Trend in Criminological Research

Given the nature of the current research, it is important to recognize that some researchers have begun to empirically test integrated models of criminal behaviour. In doing so they have illustrated the critical importance of including both person and situation factors in these models (Steinke 1991; Nagin and Paternoster 1993; Sellers 1999; Nakhaie et al. 2000). In a study of prison violence, for example, Steinke (1991) found that both personality and situational factors were required to provide an adequate explanation of violent behaviour in prisons. Steinke (1991: 120) makes the obvious yet critical observation that "violence necessarily includes not only a person but also a situation."

For another example, Nagin and Paternoster (1993) used hypothetical scenarios to examine the effects of low self-control, opportunity, situational factors and perceived costs and benefits in relation to respondents perceptions as to whether or not they would engage in the offences of drunk driving, larceny, and sexual assault. These researchers found evidence to support the effects of enduring individual differences associated with low self-control, as well as the effects of opportunity related factors such as accessibility and vulnerability of the target. Piquero and Tibbetts (1996) extended the work of Nagin and Paternoster (1993) and concluded that "time-stable variables such as low self-control will always precede and influence the situational variables" (Piquero and Tibbetts 1996: 505). These examples show that to study persons without situations or situations without persons will provide only part of the explanation.

Still, the testing of integrated models, and in particular those that include an examination of the effects of gender across varying situations and domains, have been essentially nonexistent. For example, Luckenbill's (1977) work does not address the effects of gender in relation to "character contests" at all. Similarly, the work of Felson and Steadman (1983) on situational factors in relation to violent disputes is based on a sample of males. Fortunately though, the research to date does indicate a move in the direction of integrated analyses (in addition to the studies discussed so far, see for example, Laner, Benin, and Ventrone 2001; Pryor, Giedd, and Williams 1995; and Moskowitz 1993). Consequently, the current study is in line with this recent trend.

Preliminary Findings from Kennedy and Forde

Preliminary analyses of the Conflict Data carried out by Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999) and Forde and Kennedy (1997) are also relevant to the current study. Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999) conducted a pooled regression analysis of the effects of several independent variables across twelve hypothetical scenarios involving some form of conflict on the dependent variables of *Upset*, *Claiming* and *Aggression* (Appendix D).[12] These researchers conducted a pooled regression analysis, because, it allows for the examination of the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables for all twelve scenarios combined—the scenario is the unit of analysis. For example, the effects of the independent variable *Gender of Harm Doer* on the dependent variable of *Upset* can be examined for all twelve scenarios at once.

In terms of person characteristics and the use of violence, Kennedy and Forde (1999) found that *Gender of Respondent* has a significant effect on *Upset*, *Claiming* and *Aggression* (defined as the willingness to use physical force) across the twelve scenarios.[13] Next, while previous research has found that younger people are more likely to engage in violence than are older people, these researchers find no effects of *Age of Respondent* on *Aggression* or *Upset*, (although age does have an effect on *Claiming*). Finally, household income was used as an indicator of socioeconomic status but was found to have no effects on routine conflict across the twelve scenarios.

With regard to situational variables, Kennedy and Forde's (1996, 1999) analyses reveal several situational effects on their dependent variables of *Upset*, *Claiming* and *Aggression* (Appendix D). In addition, they examined *Upset* and *Claiming* as independent variables that influence *Aggression*. Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999) first report a direct positive effect of *Upset* on *Aggression*. Second, they found an effect of *Gender of Harm Doer* on *Upset* and *Aggression*—respondents were more likely to be upset by and use physical force against a male harm doer—but not *Claiming* across the twelve scenarios. Third, the effects of *Age of Harm Doer* were found for *Upset* only—respondents were less upset with older harm doers as compared to younger harm doers. Fourth, Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999) report a direct positive effect of *Intensity* on *Upset*, *Claiming* and *Aggression*. Finally, Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999) found no direct effects of *Respondent Alone* (whether or not the respondent is alone or with a friend(s)) on *Upset*, *Claiming* and *Aggression*.

Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999) also tested for interactions between the structural characteristics (age, gender and class) of respondents and harm doers (Appendix D). They examined these interactions in terms of whether or not the respondents' characteristics were the same or different from those of the hypothetical harm doers they faced. Thus, the interaction terms tested by Kennedy and Forde (1996) were same-gender, same-age, and same-SES (social class). Of these interaction terms, Kennedy and Forde (1996) found a significant effect of same-gender on *Aggression* in that situations involving a male respondent and a male harm doer were the most likely to result in the use of force. However, no significant effects were found for *Upset* or *Claiming* with regard to the same-gender interaction term. In addition, the other interaction terms (same-age and same-SES) did not have a significant effect on any of the three dependent variables.

Using the Conflict Data, Forde and Kennedy (1997) further examined the effects of low self-control in relation to routine conflict. These researchers predicted that low self-control would influence how upset individuals would be in conflict situations, whether or not they would make a claim (i.e., demand reparation) and whether or not they would use aggression in these disputes.[14] Using LISREL, Forde and Kennedy (1997) found that most of the elements of self-control had effects on routine conflict, in particular, they found direct effects of most of the components of self-control on the willingness of respondents to use aggression.

To summarize, of particular interest to the current research is that when examining all twelve scenarios combined, *Gender of Respondent*, *Gender of Harm Doer*, and the same-gender interaction term have significant effects on the use of *Aggression* in the hypothetical scenarios (Kennedy and Forde 1999). In addition, *Self-control* has a significant effect on *Aggression* (Forde and Kennedy 1997).

It is important to reiterate here that the current study differs from the previous research of Kennedy and Forde (1999) and Forde and Kennedy (1997) in that the unit of analysis is the *respondent* rather than the scenario. Moreover, as will be discussed in Chapter Three, the analyses in this study will not be pooled. Instead, the analyses will entail an examination of the effects of person and situation factors, along with their interactions, on *Aggression* at the level of smaller sets of scenarios grouped by social domain and at the level of individual scenarios. As a result, the current study will show how different individuals respond to different types of conflict situations.

The Interactionist Model and Violence

Guided by the theoretical framework of routine conflict theory, the current study borrows the interactionist position from social psychology to explore individual and situational variation, and the effects of gender in the social processes of violence. Through the inclusion of both enduring individual differences and situational factors, the interactionist position permits an integrated analysis of violence. The routine conflict perspective, along with a consideration of the findings from past research and the strengths and limitations of the available data, have informed the selection of several important individual and situational level variables to be included in the model.

Individual Level of Analysis: Person Factors

Gender of Respondent

It has been established that in general, males engage in more violence than females (Felson 1996; Kruttschnitt 1993, 1994; Campbell and Muncer 1996; Markowitz and Felson 1998; Koski and Mangold 1988). As discussed in Chapter One, crime statistics indicate that males are more likely than females to be both the perpetrators and the victims of violence (Harris 1991; Marvell and Moody 1999; Campbell and Muncer 1998; Felson 2000; Silverman and Kennedy 1987). Consequently, in contrast to gender-neutral studies, gender is central to the current analysis of violent situations. At the same time, this study cannot be categorized as gender-specific, because both males and females are included in the analysis.

Moreover, it is important to recognize that this research does not assume that female violence necessitates a different brand of theoretical explanation from male violence. Both males and females are seen as individuals who experience conflict and who may engage in violence as a method for dealing with that conflict. At the same time, it must be made clear that this study is not trying to prove that females are as violent as males—it is not a contest. Instead, the goal is to examine the effects of gender in situations of conflict in order to identify factors that influence the willingness of both males and females to use violence in disputes.

Significantly, while gender is commonly viewed as a fixed characteristic of persons, gender can also be conceptualized as a factor that is situation-contingent. This is the case in the current research. In other words, gender is not viewed as static in nature. Instead, it is proposed that the effects of gender will vary when other individual and situational factors are taken into account. Significantly, if the effects of gender are found to vary across situations, through the specification of these conditions of variability this study can expand our knowledge of the relationship between gender and violence. Moreover, a finding of variability across situations will serve to challenge past sex-based assumptions regarding the behavioural differences between males and females and direct more attention towards the normative aspects of gender related effects.

Age of Respondent

While Kennedy and Forde (1999) did not find a statistically significant relationship between *Age of Respondent* and the use of violence in disputes, past research has indicated that there is an association between age and violent behaviour. The effects of age may, however, vary in accordance with other person characteristics as well as situational factors associated with violence. For instance, a young person with attitudes that do not favor the use of violence may be less likely to engage in such behaviour. Similarly, a young person with a high level of self-control should be less likely to use physical force as a means for dealing with conflict. In contrast, an older person might use violence if the situation is intense and they are upset. Thus, the current study will examine age in conjunction with other important variables and will therefore reveal both individual and situational factors associated with the potential variation in age effects.

Low Self-Control

Given the findings from Forde and Kennedy (1997), along with the fact that the concept of self-control has dominated criminological research and discussion at the individual level of analysis for over a decade, self-control will be included in the current model as a measure of personality. Through the examination of self-control in conjunction with several other person characteristics and situational variables, this study will shed light on the statement from Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990: 89) that low self-control "can be counteracted by situational conditions or other properties of the individual." For example, a male who has low self-control may still be less likely to strike an elderly target, or a female target in the presence of bystanders. Hence, both individual factors and situational circumstances may interfere with the effects of low self-control on violence.[15]

Attitudes Towards Violence

In view of the social constructionist elements of routine conflict theory, attitudes towards violence are viewed as an important cognitive factor associated with the use of violence (Vernberg, Jacobs and Hershberger 1999). More specifically, attitudes towards violence constitute the content of violent behavioural scripts, or a predisposition to use violence in certain types of situations. At the same time though, it is argued that the strength of the relationship between attitudes and behaviour will vary with other person characteristics and situational factors—these factors may constrain or activate the power of attitudes. For example, an elderly female who believes that violence is acceptable in situations of self-defence may not be physically able to act on those beliefs. In contrast, an individual who does not generally condone the use of violence may use violence in very intense circumstances. Finally, some individuals may condone the use of violence between males, but not between females or between a male and a female.

Fear of Crime

Similar to attitudes towards violence, fear of crime is in this study considered to be a significant cognitive factor associated with scripts for behaviour in conflict-oriented situations, because fear may influence the way individuals respond to a particular set of circumstances. More specifically, fear may interrupt regular cognitive processing such that an individual may behave in a manner that is not consistent with their person characteristics (age, gender, attitudes, self-control) or with a clearer view of the situation (alternatives may be less obvious). Consequently, this variable represents an important element in the current model.

Past Victimization

In this study, victimization is used as an indicator of past experience with crime or violence. Drawing on the inferences of routine conflict theory, similar to attitudes towards violence and fear of crime, past victimization experiences should have an influence on the way individuals perceive and therefore respond to situations of conflict. For instance, if a person has previously been physically assaulted, situations of conflict that become physical may be perceived as more threatening by those who have been assaulted in the past as compared to those who have not been victims of assault. This perceived threat might then interfere with their regular cognitive processes.

With regard to *Fear of Crime* and *Past Victimization*, it is important to point out that although routine conflict theory implies that these variables will influence behavioural scripts, the theory does not specify the direction of these effects. For example, past victimization may increase or decrease the potential for the use of force depending on the nature and outcome of that past experience. Consequently, the potential effects of *Fear of Crime* and *Past Victimization* will be explored as open research questions as opposed to specified, unidirectional hypotheses.

Situational Level of Analysis: Situational Factors

Upset

Luckenbill and Doyle (1989) argue that whether or not an individual will consider the use of aggression as a means for dealing with conflict will depend on how upset they are. In their model, Luckenbill and Doyle (1989) refer to this step in the escalation of conflict as *Naming*. As noted, Kennedy and Forde (1999) found a statistically significant relationship between *Upset* and *Aggression* in the original Conflict Study. However, these researchers did not examine this relationship in conjunction with other person and situation factors. Thus, the current study will examine *Upset* in relation to the likelihood of violence in conjunction with other person characteristics and within the context of different types of situations and domains.[16]

Gender of Harm Doer

It has been discussed that males are more likely than females to be involved in violence—both as perpetrators *and* as victims (Harris 1991; Marvell and Moody 1999; Campbell and Muncer 1998; Felson 2000; Silverman and Kennedy 1987; Kennedy and Forde 1999). In addition, research suggests that both males and females feel more threatened by a male harm doer (Felson and Messner 1996). Consequently, the gender-dynamic of conflict situations is a significant factor in terms of whether or not violence will occur. *Gender of Respondent*, *Gender of Harm Doer* and the interaction between these two variables are critical to the current analysis. With specific regard to *Gender of Harm Doer*, it is expected that individuals will be more likely to report that they would use violence against a male harm doer as opposed to a female harm doer.

Age of Harm Doer

Kennedy and Forde (1999) did not find a statistically significant relationship between *Age of Harm Doer* and *Aggression* in the original Conflict Study. Nevertheless, as with *Age of Respondent*, depending on the nature of the conflict situation *Age of Harm Doer* may influence whether or not a respondent believes that they would resort to the use of violence. For example, an older opponent may be perceived as less of a physical threat than a younger opponent, and therefore, the respondent may perceive there to be less need for the use of physical force. In addition, there may be stronger normative barriers in place with regard to the use of aggression against an older person versus a younger person—that is, who makes a suitable target.

Intensity

Kennedy and Forde (1999) report a statistically significant relationship between *Intensity* and *Aggression.* Indeed, an individual should be more likely to use physical force in response to a physical assault than to verbal insults, for example. At the same time though, other situational factors and person characteristics may serve to counteract the strength or direction of the effects of intensity. For instance, older respondents may be less physically able to respond with force, regardless of the intensity of the situation or their willingness to do so. In addition, if a male respondent is physically assaulted (high intensity) by a female they may be less likely to respond with physical force than if the assailant had been a male. Consequently, the current study will examine the consistency of the effects of intensity in conjunction with the other situational factors and person characteristics included in the model.

Respondent Alone

While *Respondent Alone* was not statistically significant in the Conflict Study, research relating to the presence of bystanders in situations of social conflict has revealed the significance of this variable to the dynamics associated with the potential for violence (Felson and Steadman 1983). Depending on the circumstances of a particular situation, bystanders may choose to encourage or discourage the use of violence. For instance, the gender-dynamic of the conflict my influence how bystanders respond. Bystanders may encourage a physical fight between two males, or even between two females, but discourage such an altercation between a male and a female. It is essential then to consider the role of bystanders in conjunction with other person and situational factors.

Interaction Effects

Finally, several interaction terms will be examined. The primary interaction of interest is the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* (Kennedy and Forde 1999). It is expected that males will be more likely to use violence overall; however, it is further predicted that males will be more likely to use violence against other males rather than females. All of the interaction terms are presented in the form of hypotheses below.

Hypotheses For the Current Research

Based on previous research from Kennedy and Forde (1999) and Forde and Kennedy (1997) as well as the literature review conducted for the current study, several hypotheses were developed.[17] It is important to recognize at the outset that this is a multivariate analysis. Consequently, each of these hypotheses must be interpreted as predicted net effects. In other words, all other things being held equal, the predictions relating to person and situation variables and violence are as follows:

Person Characteristics

Hypothesis 1: Respondents' willingness to use physical force will differ according to the ***Gender of Respondent***. Male respondents will be more willing to use physical force than female respondents.

Hypothesis 2: Respondents' willingness to use physical force will differ according to the ***Age of Respondent***. Younger respondents will be more willing to use physical force than older respondents.

Hypothesis 3: Respondents' willingness to use physical force will differ according to ***Low Self-control***. Respondents with a low level of self-control will be more willing to use physical force than respondents with a high level of self-control.

Hypothesis 4: Respondents' willingness to use physical force will differ according to ***Attitudes Towards Violence***. Respondents with positive ***Attitudes Towards Violence*** will be more willing to use physical force than respondents who do not have positive ***Attitudes Towards Violence***.

Situational Factors

Hypothesis 5: Respondents' willingness to use physical force will differ according to ***Upset***. As ***Upset*** increases respondents' willingness to use physical force will increase.

Hypothesis 6: Respondents' willingness to use physical force will differ according to ***Intensity***. As ***Intensity*** increases respondents' willingness to use physical force will increase.

Hypothesis 7: Respondents' willingness to use physical force will differ according to ***Gender of Harm Doer***. Respondents' willingness to use physical force will be greater when the harm doer is male than when the harm doer is female.

Hypothesis 8: Respondents' willingness to use physical force will differ according to ***Age of Harm Doer***. Respondents' willingness to use physical force will be greater when the harm doer is younger than when the harm doer is older.

Hypothesis 9: Respondents' willingness to use physical force will not differ according to ***Respondent Alone***. Respondents' willingness to use physical force will be no greater when there are others present than when there are no others present.

Interaction Hypotheses

Hypothesis 10: The effect of ***Respondent Alone*** on the willingness to use physical force will differ according to the ***Gender of Respondent*** and the ***Gender of Harm Doer***. When ***Gender of Respondent*** and ***Gender of Harm Doer*** are equal (i.e., two males or two females) the presence of others will increase respondents' willingness to use physical force. When ***Gender of Respondent*** and ***Gender of Harm Doer*** are not equal (i.e., a male and a female) the presence of others will decrease respondents' willingness to use physical force.[18]

Hypothesis 11: The effect of ***Gender of Respondent*** will differ according to ***Gender of Harm Doer***. Male respondents will be more likely to use physical force when the harm doer is male than when the harm doer is female.

Hypothesis 12: The effect of ***Intensity*** will differ according to ***Gender of Harm Doer***. Situations that have a high level of ***Intensity*** will be more likely to result in the use of physical force when the harm doer is male than when the harm doer is female.

Hypothesis 13: The effect of ***Upset*** will differ according to ***Gender of Respondent***. Of respondents who are upset, female respondents will be less willing to use physical force than male respondents.

Hypothesis 14: The effect of ***Upset*** will differ according to ***Age of Respondent***. Of respondents who are upset, older respondents will be less willing to use physical force than younger respondents.

Hypothesis 15: The effect of ***Low Self-control*** will differ according to ***Intensity***. Respondents who have a low level of self-control will be more willing to use physical force in high ***Intensity*** situations than in low ***Intensity*** situations.[19]

Research Questions

Research Question 1: Do past victimization experiences have an effect on the willingness to use physical force? If so, what is the direction of this effect? Do past victimization experiences increase or decrease the willingness to use force?

Research Question 2: Is fear of crime related to the willingness to use physical force? If so, what is nature of this relationship?

Chapter Summary

This chapter has established the significance of examining person characteristics, situational factors, and the interaction between person and situational factors in the study of violence. It has further been argued that past research has undervalued the effects of gender in relation to violent situations, and that this neglect stems greatly from the traditional, positivist focus on criminality rather than crime. The focus on criminality has resulted in a tendency to conduct gender-specific research at the individual level of analysis, while neglecting the exploration of a potentially more interesting relationship between gender and violence at the level of situation (e.g., interactions between gender and other variables). Thus, in addition to the need to investigate violence as a process that is influenced by both individual and situational factors, it is essential to acknowledge the importance of gender and to analyse the effects of gender in relation to the use of violence in disputes.

Altogether, the current study draws together and extends the work of Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999), as well as other past research, in the following important ways. Most prominently, through the adoption of an interactionist position, person factors, situation factors and their interactions are examined together in the same model. In view of the fact that few studies have examined such interactions, the inclusion of these terms in the model is significant. In addition, special attention is paid to the effects of gender. In conjunction with the adoption of the interactionist position, this will allow for the effects of gender to be located within the person-situation context. The current analyses will demonstrate the relative power of person factors, situation factors and person-situation interaction effects for explaining the use of physical force as a means for dealing with conflict. As a result, the social processes of violence can be more thoroughly investigated than in past research studies where situational factors, interactions, and gender have often been neglected.

Chapter Three will discuss issues relating to the operationalization and measurement of the variables and present a detailed description of the data set, research methods and sample characteristics.

CHAPTER THREE: Data, Methods and Sample Characteristics

Introduction

As discussed in the previous two chapters, the objective of the present study is to explore the characteristics of those who are most likely to use physical force to settle a dispute, as well as the situational circumstances under which they are most likely to engage in such behaviour. As revealed in Chapter One, the major research questions for the current study are first, what are some of the primary person characteristics related to violence? Second, what are some of the primary situational factors related to the use of violence? Third, what combination of individual and situational factors is most likely to result in a violent response? Fourth, what interaction effects exist among these variables? And finally, what are the effects of gender in relation to the above listed major research questions? This chapter introduces the data set and the methodology that will be used to address the research questions. The sample characteristics will also be presented.

Research Design and Sample

In order to test the hypotheses introduced in Chapter Two, secondary analysis has been conducted on data gathered by Kennedy and Forde (1999) in 1994. This data set is referred to as the Conflict Data Set. These data were compiled from a representative survey of 2052 members of the general population living in Alberta and Manitoba, Canada. The population universe for the study was defined as "all persons living in a dwelling unit…that could be contacted by direct dialing" (Kennedy and Forde 1999: 136).

The research design comprised a two-stage sampling process that first obtained a probability sample of households, and second, a selection of adult respondents that ensured an equal number of male and female participants (Kennedy and Forde 1999).[20] As stated, the sample was drawn from the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, and it includes both rural and urban areas.[21] Sampling in Alberta was conducted in three areas, which were Edmonton, Calgary and the 'remainder of the province'. For Manitoba, sampling was conducted in Winnipeg and the 'remainder of the province'.[22]

Data Collection

In Alberta, the Population Research Laboratory at the University of Alberta was commissioned to gather the Conflict Project data, while in Manitoba these data were collected by the Winnipeg Area Study (Kennedy and Forde 1999). Both of these organizations employ professional interviewers, and it is therefore assumed that the quality of data gathered by these organizations is of a very high standard. In both provinces, the extensive Conflict Questionnaire was administered via a telephone survey. Kennedy and Forde (1999: 39) state that "the average length of an interview was thirty-four minutes."

In Alberta, the response rate for the survey was approximately 75%, while in Manitoba the response rate was close to 77%, which is considered acceptable for a telephone survey (Babbie 1989). If a respondent refused to participate in the study the interviewer completed a refusal call sheet. The call sheets were then examined later by a supervisor in order to determine whether or not another attempt at an interview should be made. To ensure that an adequate response rate would be achieved Kennedy and Forde (1999) report that multiple callback attempts were made before determining that contact could not be made with a particular respondent. Of those interviews that were completed, approximately 29% of respondents were contacted a second time by a research supervisor for the purpose of validating the interview, and therefore, further scrutinizing the quality of these data.

In terms of ethical considerations, all of the questions used in the survey were reviewed by a research ethics committee, either at the University of Alberta or the University of Manitoba (Kennedy and Forde 1999: 137). In addition, all respondents were 18 years of age or older and were informed that their participation was completely voluntary. Respondents were also told that they could discontinue the interview at any time. Finally, respondents were promised that all information provided would remain confidential (Kennedy and Forde 1999).

The Research Instrument

Two primary components of the conflict survey are relevant to the current research (Appendix A). First, in one portion of the questionnaire respondents were asked a series of questions relating to past experiences with conflict, crime and victimization, as well as their perceptions of crime and attitudes towards violence (Kennedy and Forde 1999). In addition, respondents were presented with attitudinal questions relating to self-control.[23] Taken together with the demographic data, this information can be used to explore the effects of person characteristics on the use of force during interpersonal disputes.

The second portion of the questionnaire that is relevant to the current research is a scenario component that is used to measure the effects of situational factors on the use of violence. Based in part on a suggestion from Luckenbill and Doyle (1989), Kennedy and Forde (1999) developed a number of hypothetical scenarios to test their routine conflict theory (Appendix B). The use of hypothetical scenarios allows for the investigation of individuals' responses to situations that vary in terms of circumstance and intensity. In addition, rather than asking respondents to imagine situations in which they might use violence, individuals are presented with a standardized set of questions relating to how they would behave within a specified set of circumstances (Kennedy and Forde 1999). This method allows for a more consistent analysis across respondents.

In designing this research instrument, Kennedy and Forde (1996) follow the advice of Rossi and Nock (1982) who advocate the use of a factorial survey design. The factorial design permits the random assignment of scenarios to respondents, thus facilitating the analysis of many different types of scenarios while decreasing respondent burden (Kennedy and Forde 1996, 1999). According to Kennedy and Forde (1996: 422) "a strength of a factorial survey design is that a wider variety of social situations may be presented to respondents than they would encounter in their daily lives." In support of the factorial design, Bursik and Baba (1986: 80) argue that "the recent work of Peter Rossi and his associates in the design of factorial surveys…seems to be a very promising solution to the merging of the benefits of experimental research in the more general survey situation." These researchers point out that this approach allows for the estimation of the weights given to each component of the situation (Bursik and Baba 1986).

For their research, Kennedy and Forde (1999) created twelve scenarios relating to the four broad social domains of the workplace, street, family and leisure—three scenarios fall into each of the domains (see Appendix B). The scenarios for each domain are listed in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: The Conflict Scenarios

	Domain			
Scenario	Work	Street	Domestic	Leisure
One	Schoolyard	Convenience	Spousal	Sporting
Two	Worker	Robbery	Child	Pub
Three	Customer	Traffic Accident	Neighbor	Vacation

Table 3.1 illustrates how the twelve conflict scenarios correspond with a particular social domain; however, each of the scenarios varies in context (Appendix B). For example, in the Worker Scenario the respondent is an employee in an office and is faced with a stranger making a complaint, whereas in the Robbery Scenario, the respondent is walking home from a restaurant when someone stops them and demands money. In the Pub Scenario the respondent is using a VLT when another individual demands to use the machine. In contrast, in the Child Scenario, the respondent is never a direct target, but instead is questioned about whether or not they would intervene (with force) in a situation where a child is being yelled at or hit by another adult. Overall, there is fair amount of variety in terms of the circumstances that respondents are presented with in the scenarios.

In addition to this more general variation in circumstance, Luckenbill and Doyle (1989: 430) explain that "in a factorial survey, the content of each scenario is generated randomly based on a list of the possible conditions within each situational dimension." Thus, the scenarios are created through the random assignment of several dimensions, such as *Intensity* and *Gender of Harm Doer*, to each, for the purpose of developing a range of possible conflict situations. For example, in the Worker Scenario, the respondent may be confronted by an elderly male or a young female, they may be working alone or with others, and the stranger may be yelling at them or even pushing them (Appendix B). For another example, in the Pub Scenario the respondent might be alone or with friends and the individual who initiates the conflict may be young or old, a man or a woman. The key point though is that in every case, the situational characteristics of each scenario are randomly generated.

The objective of a factorial survey is to then randomly assign the various manipulations to respondents. Kennedy and Forde (1996: 422) explain how they achieved this random assignment in the original Conflict Study as follows:

> We printed a copy of all of the possible combinations in each of the 12 scenarios. Next we scrambled the order of attributes in each set by shuffling the paper. Third, a random numbers table was used to select one scenario from each of the four domains, four scenarios in all, for each questionnaire. Fourth, we printed five copies of the randomly ordered scenario sets so that we would have enough copies of scenarios for 2400 completed interviews. Finally, the scenarios were inserted in and stapled into the complete questionnaire.

In this way, the effects of each condition within the various scenarios can be examined.

To summarize the process so far then, each questionnaire was designed to include four of the twelve hypothetical conflict scenarios. The objective of the experiment was to randomly distribute one scenario from within each domain to each respondent. In addition, the conditions within each scenario (e.g., *Gender of Harm Doer* and *Intensity*) are randomly distributed. This means that each respondent receives four separate scenarios, one from each domain, and each with randomized conditions. Then, in reference to Luckenbill and Doyle's (1989) model, for each scenario, respondents were asked how upset they would be (*Naming*), whether or not they would demand reparation (*Claiming*), and, whether or not they would respond with physical force should their demands not be met (*Aggression*).[24]

In the current research, the four sets of scenarios will be referred to as 'Trials'—one Trial for each set of scenarios presented to the respondents for a total of four Trials. To explain further, all of the scenarios presented to all of the respondents as their first of four scenarios constitute Trial One. All of the scenarios presented to all of the respondents as their second scenario constitute Trial Two, their third set of scenarios constitute Trial Three and their fourth set of scenarios constitute Trial Four. As an example then, Trial One refers to all subjects' responses to their first randomly assigned scenario.

Given that the objective of the experiment was to provide each respondent with one scenario from each of the four domains, the result is that each Trial is made up of a number of different scenarios depending on which scenario respondents received first, second, third and fourth. Based on the description of how the questionnaires were put together, it was expected that each of the four Trials would correspond with a particular domain; however, it was discovered that this was not always the case. To illustrate, Table 3.2. shows the percentage of respondents that received each of the scenarios corresponding with a particular domain across the four Trials.

Table 3.2: Distribution of Scenarios by Trial

		Trial			
Domain	Scenario	One	Two	Three	Four
Work	Schoolyard	24.3%	.8%		7.6%
	Worker	25.0%	.4%		7.6%
	Customer	28.4%	.3%		5.6%
Street	Convenience Store		23.8%	8.6%	
	Robbery		25.0%	7.6%	
	Traffic Accident		29.0%	6.1%	
Domestic	Spousal		6.8%	25.8%	.6%
	Child		6.0%	27.7%	.3%
	Neighbor		7.9%	24.2%	.6%
Leisure	Sporting Event	8.3%			24.6%
	Pub	7.0%			26.4%
	Vacation	7.0%			26.8%

Table 3.2 shows that each Trial is in fact dominated by a particular domain, and therefore, particular scenarios; however, a number of respondents were given scenarios that are not from the primary domain. For example, in the first Trial the majority of respondents received the Schoolyard, Worker or Consumer Scenarios from the Work Domain, but a significant number of respondents also received scenarios from the Leisure Domain. An examination of the original data revealed that a percentage of respondents were given their scenarios in reverse order; thus, except in the case of error, all respondents did receive one scenario from each domain as was expected.

Although the four domains do not correspond perfectly with the four Trials, the decision was made to structure the current analysis around these Trials. Even though the distribution of the domains is not exact, the scenarios *within* each domain were randomly distributed, as were the conditions *within* each scenario. In addition, the person characteristics obviously do not vary across Trials. It is further important to remember that the unit of analysis in this study is the respondent, whereas in the original Conflict

Study the unit of analysis was the scenario. Thus, while the pooled analysis conducted by Kennedy and Forde (1999) was appropriate for their unit of analysis, in this case there is greater value in analysing these data by Trials. Analysis by Trials provides the opportunity to see how respondents react to four different situations, and therefore, to examine the effects of person characteristics, situation factors, and their interactions on four separate occasions. Through a comparison of the responses to each set of scenarios, consistencies as well as possible inconsistencies in the effects of the model on willingness to use force will be exposed.

Having said that the situational characteristics within the scenarios are randomly generated and that the person characteristics do not vary across Trials, if there *is* variation in the results of the model across Trials, two possible explanations exist. The first explanation is that the variation may be a product of chance. Alternatively, however, the variation may be a reflection of differences associated with domain and scenario effects. In view of these two possibilities, this research will first explore the effects of person characteristics, situational factors and their interactions, across the Trials without taking into account potential variation relating to the domains and the scenarios. Subsequent analyses will then test for the possible effects of domain and scenario.

Setting Up the Data: Creating the Trials

The creation of the Trials was accomplished as follows. To begin, each of the twelve scenarios has a corresponding set of variables in the Conflict Data Set. For example, scenario one corresponds with the variables 'scenario one upset' and 'scenario one aggression'. The same is true for the randomly assigned situational variables that characterize each scenario. For example, there is a variable that corresponds to the gender of the harm doer in scenario one, and a variable that refers to the level of intensity for scenario one. The dependent variable and independent variables corresponding with each of the twelve scenarios were used to create the dependent and independent variables for each of the four Trials.

To illustrate how this restructuring was achieved, the creation of one independent variable for Trial One, *Gender of Harm Doer*, will be explained. First, a frequency distribution of the scenarios that make up each of the Trials (where S1Type = Trial One, S2Type = Trial Two, S3Type = Trial Three and S4Type = Trial Four) was examined to see which scenarios were included in each of the four Trials. Then, the variable *Gender of Harm Doer* for Trial One was created in the following manner:

If S1Type = 1 then Trial One Gender of Harm Doer = s1gender
If S1Type = 2 then Trial One Gender of Harm Doer = s2gender
If S1Type = 3 then Trial One Gender of Harm Doer = s3gender
If S1Type = 10 then Trial One Gender of Harm Doer = s10gender
If S1Type = 11 then Trial One Gender of Harm Doer = s11gender
If S1Type = 12 then Trial One Gender of Harm Doer = s12gender

The first statement is interpreted as follows: if the first scenario received by a respondent was scenario one, then their Trial One *Gender of Harm Doer* will correspond to the *Gender of Harm Doer* in scenario one (s1gender). Similarly, the second statement means that if the first scenario received by a respondent was scenario two, then their Trial One *Gender of Harm Doer* will correspond to the *Gender of Harm Doer* associated with scenario two (s2gender). Thus, Trial One *Gender of Harm Doer* reflects the nature of this variable in each of the scenarios included in that particular Trial. The dependent variable and the independent variables for each of the four Trials were created in the exact same way. In sum, the analyses conducted in the current study are based on these four Trials. The *N* for each Trial is 2052—one scenario and response on the dependent variable for each respondent in the sample.

Strengths and Limitations of Using Hypothetical Scenarios

With regard to the strengths and limitations of using hypothetical scenarios, Kennedy and Forde (1999) realize that some researchers will have concerns about this method. The primary question is, can we generalize from the scenarios to actual behaviour? For example, can people predict what they would do in a high intensity situation? The artificial aspect of the scenarios is that they only ask what people think they *would* do, and therefore cannot determine what they *will* do. Indeed, Nagin and Paternoster (1993) recognize that an expressed intention to engage in a certain behaviour may not necessarily translate into actual behaviour (see also Piquero and Tibbetts 1996). Moreover, Ross and Nisbett (1991) suggest that it is very difficult to predict what people will do in 'novel' situations.

On the other hand, Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) argue that there may in fact be a significant relationship between expressed intentions and actual behaviour depending on the specificity of the situations. In support of this assertion, Kim and Hunter (1993) conclude from their research that there is a strong relationship between intentions and behaviour.

Luckenbill and Doyle (1989) also address the concern from critics that scenario data is "artificial". These authors maintain however, that this 'artificiality' actually has advantages including the fact that scenarios permit experimental manipulation, something that in the real world would be unethical (Luckenbill and Doyle 1989). Relatedly, perhaps one of the most notable advantages of using scenarios is that this method permits the analysis of situations where individuals say they would not use violence. Significantly, Birkbeck and LaFree (1993) state that there is a need for information on situations that do and do not end in crime (or in this case violence) (see also Hawkins et al. 1998). Moreover, these researchers argue that

> the difficulties of tracking the situational experiences of offenders and nonoffenders suggest that situational explanations of crime are more likely to be successful when formulated and tested with experimental methods (Birkbeck and LaFree 1993: 132).

Nagin and Paternoster (1993) reveal several other advantages to using scenarios as well. First, scenarios provide the means for examining specific situational factors relating to behaviour. Second, the circumstances are provided to respondents rather than respondents *assuming* the circumstances under which certain events would occur. Third, the behaviour under study, whether it is a criminal act or otherwise, can be specifically defined in terms of the research objectives of a particular study. And fourth, there is no time between behaviour and assessment; therefore, some of the issues associated with questioning people about actual behaviours that have occurred in the past can be avoided.[25] Overall, the use of scenarios allows for greater control over the definition of the behaviour under study, as well as the power to specify the circumstances under which this behaviour of interest takes place. General support for the use of scenarios is evidenced by the frequency of their use in contemporary research (see for example, Laner et al., 2001; Campbell 1986; Nagin and Paternoster 1993; Piquero and Tibbetts 1996; Goto 1996).

In terms of using this method to study violence, while we cannot place subjects in actual conflict situations, we can question respondents about their perceived willingness to use violence in the hypothetical scenarios. In doing so it becomes possible to examine responses both in terms of person characteristics and the manipulated situational conditions of the various scenarios.

With regard to the more specific nature of the scenarios used in this research, what makes this study unlike much past research is that all of the scenarios involve strangers and most occur in a public location. While extensive research has been conducted on violence that occurs among intimates in private domains, much less research has been carried out in relation to strangers in public domains. Furthermore, it is a rare event that this type of research includes females. As evidence of this, Baskin and Sommers (1998: 115) contend that "little is known about the situational dynamics of women's participation in assaultive behaviour, especially against strangers." The fact that males and females often do not find themselves in the same types of conflict situations in the real world makes gender comparisons difficult. Significantly, these kinds of issues could not be examined by relying on official crime statistics. In contrast, by using hypothetical scenarios, the present study provides the unusual opportunity to compare the responses of males and females to the exact same sets of circumstances. As a result, this study will expose gender differences *and* similarities in routines for dealing with conflict—routines which depending on the circumstances, may result in violence.

In summary, the combination of the two primary relevant components of the survey discussed here—the information on person characteristics and the scenario component (situational factors)—provides a solid opportunity for exploring the effects of person factors, situation factors and person-situation interactions in violent disputes. The responses to the scenarios provide rich detail regarding both situational and individual variations in the willingness to use violence as a means for dealing with conflict—for both male and female respondents.

Operationalization of the Variables

Dependent Variable: Aggression

Relating back to the theoretical discussion of Luckenbill and Doyle's (1989) stages of disputes, the scenarios in this survey were developed specifically "to isolate the predispositions to the steps of upset, claiming, and aggressiveness and the conditions under which these appear" (Kennedy and Forde 1995: 15). To remain consistent with the theoretical model of disputes developed by Luckenbill and Doyle (1989), Kennedy and Forde (1999) examined *Upset* (Naming), *Claiming* and *Aggression* as three separate dependent variables within these randomized conditions.[26] In contrast, the current analysis will only examine the dependent variable *Aggression*. The variable *Upset* will remain as a predictor variable in the analysis; however, *Claiming* will not be included in the model. The reason for this research decision relates directly to the manner in which the questions about *Upset*, *Claiming* and *Aggression* were posed to respondents in the original Conflict Questionnaire.

The Conflict Questionnaire is designed such that those who responded no to *Claiming*—those who said that they would not make a demand for reparation—were not asked if they would use aggression as a means for dealing with conflict in the scenarios. In other words, the question about the use of aggression is contingent upon the response to *Claiming*. Only those who responded yes to *Claiming* were questioned about their willingness to use aggression. Given the way these data are structured then, *Claiming* cannot be included in the model as a predictor of *Aggression*, because it is a constant.[27]

It is important to recognize that Kennedy and Forde's (1999) decision to make the aggression question contingent upon *Claiming* is based on the theoretical assumption underlying Luckenbill and Doyle's (1989) model, that those who say they would not make a claim will not use aggression. Luckenbill and Doyle (1989) assume that *Upset* (Naming) leads to *Claiming*, which leads to *Aggression.* Kennedy and Forde (1999) thus structured their questionnaire on the basis of this theoretical assumption. Unfortunately though, structuring the questionnaire in this manner means that Luckenbill and Doyle's (1989) model cannot be fully tested. Kennedy and Forde (1999) have made it impossible to empirically test the assumptions of this model of disputes with regard to claiming.

The structure of the scenario component of the Conflict Data also needs to be considered in relation to the creation of the dependent variable of *Aggression.* In view of the fact that the question about *Aggression* is contingent upon the response to *Claiming*, there are actually two different ways in which *Aggression* can be constituted. The first option is to limit the analyses to those respondents who said yes to *Claiming* and to code those who said yes to *Aggression* as 1 and those who said no to *Aggression* as 0.

The second option necessitates the acceptance of Luckenbill and Doyle's (1989) assumption that *Aggression* will only occur if *Claiming* occurs first. In this case, the dependent variable can be structured so that those who say no to *Claiming* are included in the analysis. This can be achieved by placing those who say no to *Claiming* in the same category with those who say no to *Aggression.* These respondents would be coded as 0, while those who responded that they would use aggression would be coded as 1. This second option permits the inclusion of the entire sample in the analyses as opposed to only those who say yes to *Claiming.*

For the purposes of the current study both forms of the dependent variable were initially created. Preliminary analyses comparing the two dependent variables revealed minimal differences, and therefore, the decision was made to use the second form of the dependent variable in the analyses (Appendix E). This means that respondents who said no to *Claiming* will be included in the analysis and will be coded as 0 along with those who say no to *Aggression*. This research decision reflects the theoretical assumption of Luckenbill and Doyle (1989) model of disputes. While it is preferable that *Aggression* not be a contingency question, unfortunately this is a limitation that exists and therefore must be tolerated.

The dependent variable *Aggression* is operationalized in terms of whether or not the respondent would use physical force to resolve the dispute. The definition of 'physical force' was left to the determination of the respondent. Kennedy and Forde (1999: 60) state that they were "interested in any physical action of aggressing they would take to stop the potential harm doer." The wording of questions relating to the use of aggression varied in accordance with the nature of the particular scenario. For example, the question might read "*If he continued to yell at you, would you use physical force to make him stop?*" or, "*If she continued to push you, would you use physical force to make her stop?*" (Kennedy and Forde 1999). The respondent is required to answer yes (coded 1) or no (coded 0) to whether or not they would use physical force.

Given that this study is based on a sample of the general population, and that the behaviour under investigation will in some cases be considered deviant, the reported level of aggression is not expected to be high. In fact, other studies that have examined deviant behaviours have revealed low reports. For example, Nagin and Paternoster (1993: 483) used scenarios to examine intentions of respondents to engage in drunk driving, larceny and sexual assault, and found that the majority of respondents said they would not do any of the behaviours—their "modal response category on the dependent variable was zero." Something that should be considered then, is that there may be a certain level of reluctance associated with reporting deviant behaviour, and that this reluctance may extend to questions that are hypothetical in nature.

Independent Variables: Person Characteristics

The independent variables analyzed in the current study include the person and situation factors introduced in Chapter Two. The person factors are; *Gender of Respondent*, *Age of Respondent*, *Low Self-control*, *Attitudes Towards Violence*, *Fear of Crime* and *Past Victimization*. The situational factors include one factor borrowed from Luckenbill and Doyle's (1989) model of disputes which is *Naming*—operationalized as *Upset*—as well as *Gender of Harm Doer*, *Age of Harm Doer*, *Intensity*, and *Respondent Alone* (presence of others). In addition, a number of interaction terms will be included in the model. The operationalization of each of the independent variables is discussed below.

Gender of Respondent

How best to define and operationalize gender is a common theme in social science research (Allen 1998). Belknap (1996: 8) argues that "differences between males and females have been divided into two categories: sex differences and gender differences." Sex differences typically relate to biological differences, while gender differences generally refer to social differences—the roles that males and females play in society. However, Kruttschnitt (1994: 294) points out that "because gender is imposed on sex by acculturation and socialization, it is not surprising to find that these two concepts are still used interchangeably." Accordingly, in this study *sex* will be used as the indicator for *gender*. This variable is constructed as a dummy variable where males are coded as 1 and females are coded as 0.

Age of Respondent

In the survey questionnaire respondents were asked to report their exact age (Kennedy and Forde 1999). Thus, age is included in the model as an interval level variable.

Low Self-Control

The original Conflict Questionnaire includes a modified version of the 24-item scale of self-control developed by Grasmick et al. (1993) (Appendix F). Grasmick et al. (1993) identify six components of self-control from the general theory which are impulsivity; a preference for simple tasks; risk seeking; a preference for physical rather than mental activity; self-centeredness; and temper. These researchers developed 24 attitudinal-based measures of these six components and conducted a principal-components analysis of all 24 items. Grasmick et al. (1993) concluded that measuring self-control as a single personality trait was preferable (see also Arneklev et al. 1993). It is important to note that Hirschi and Gottfredson (1993) have criticized the use of attitudinal measures by Grasmick and his colleagues, in part because they believe that level of self-control will influence individuals' responses to survey questions (see also Piquero et al. 2000). Nevertheless, Forde and Kennedy (1997) argue that major tests of the general theory have used this scale (see also Arneklev et al. 1993). Importantly, in a review of the empirical status of the general theory, Pratt and Cullen (2000: 946) reported that "the effect size of the self-control variable is not significantly affected by whether the scale used to measure self-control is Grasmick et al.'s (1993) version or an alternative attitudinal scale." In addition, Pratt and Cullen (2000) did find that in addition to various behavioural measures, attitudinal measures are also strong predictors of crime in studies that test self-control. In general, it can be argued that until Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) reveal what they feel are the best indicators of self-control, different researchers will develop different measures based on their interpretations of the general theory.

In the Conflict Study Forde and Kennedy (1997) made several minor modifications to the original scale of self-control developed by Grasmick et al. (1993) (see Appendix F). As a result of these modifications, the scale used by Forde and Kennedy (1997) is based on 23 items rather than the original 24 items. As with the original scale of self-control developed by Grasmick et al. (1993), each of the 23 items is operationalized in terms of a four-point Likert scale coded as strongly agree (1), somewhat agree (2), somewhat disagree (3) and strongly disagree (4), 'don't know' (8), and 'no response' (0). This scale was then re-coded in the reverse so that a high score represents *low* self-control and a low score represents high self-control. Thus, the re-code is as follows: strongly agree (4), somewhat agree (3), somewhat disagree (2) and strongly disagree (1), 'don't know' (8) and 'no response' (0). While this re-code may seem counterintuitive, it is consistent with existing literature. These ordinal level variables were then analyzed as if they were interval level variables (Kennedy and Forde 1997).[28]

To operationalize self-control, Forde and Kennedy (1997) conducted a principal-components factor analysis on the 23 items selected from the original 24-item scale developed by Grasmick et al. (1993). In contrast to Grasmick et al. (1993), they found that 6 factors emerged, one factor representing each of the 6 components of self-control discussed by Hirschi and Gottfredson (1990).[29] As a result, Forde and Kennedy (1997) argue that their results indicate a multidimensionality of factors. These researchers suggest that among other things, the fact that their sample is larger and has a lower mean age than that of Grasmick et al. (1993) may in part explain some of the divergence in findings concerning multidimensionality (Forde and Kennedy 1997).

Notwithstanding the fact that the present study is using the same data set as that analyzed by Forde and Kennedy (1997), the decision has been made to use a composite scale of self-control as opposed to measuring the six components of self-control separately. This decision is based on several factors, the first and foremost of which is the desire for a parsimonious model (see Burton et al. 1998). Given that self-control is just one of a number of person and situation variables to be examined in this study, to measure the six components separately would necessarily lead to an excess of variables in the model. In relation to the issue of parsimony, the second reason for using a composite scale relates to the fact that one of the primary goals of this study is to examine interaction effects between person and situation variables, for example, the interaction between self-control and the intensity of the situation. Consequently, the model would quickly become convoluted if it were necessary to examine interaction effects of all six of the components with *Intensity*. A third reason for using a composite scale is that it is not the purpose of the present study to perform an in-depth analysis and test of the theory of self-control. Instead, self-control is used as a personality dimension component, and is one of many of the person characteristics in this person-situation model.[30]

In sum, the research objectives of the present study demand a parsimonious measure of self-control that can be examined in combination and in interaction with other variables in a manner that is not unnecessarily complex. Thus, in order to construct a scale of self-control for the current study, a reliability analysis was conducted with the 23 items used by Forde and Kennedy (1997) as adapted from the Grasmick et al. (1993) scale (Appendix F). The final scale was constructed by averaging the responses to 21 self-control items, resulting in a score on self-control ranging between 1 and 4 for each respondent. A score of 4 indicates *low* self-control while a score of 1 indicates *high* self-control. Again, this coding is consistent with existing literature on *Low Self-control.* Respondents who gave no response on a particular item (original code 0) or responded 'don't know' (original code 8) were coded as missing.

Attitudes Towards Violence

For the purposes of the current research *Attitudes Towards Violence* is used as an indicator of the normative legitimization (or lack there of), of violence by respondents. Attitudes towards violence are measured through the use of nine questions originally created by Ball-Rokeach (1973) (Appendix A). These questions were designed to examine values that are supportive of violence. Limiting the analysis to male respondents, Ball-Rokeach (1973) questioned individuals about their approval of the use of violence by an adult male stranger or a male police officer in a number of different situations.

Some noteworthy criticisms have been lodged against the Ball-Rokeach (1973) questions. To begin, the questions have been called "artificial" because they only involve male adult strangers (Kennedy and Forde 1999). Given that a great deal of violence occurs between people who know each other, it has been suggested that the questions developed by Ball-Rokeach (1973) cannot adequately test general attitudes towards violence. Relatedly, another criticism that needs to be made is that the questions do not examine approval of violence by females in the same situations. As a result, the investigation of the effects of gender in this study is limited to the approval or disapproval of the use of violence by males against males, by male versus female respondents only.

It has further been suggested that the Ball-Rokeach (1973) questions actually measure different types of attitudes towards violence, namely 'violent', 'defensive' and residual attitudes that are considered to be neither violent nor defensive (Kennedy and Forde 1999). Kennedy and Forde (1999: 51) state that they "agree with this assessment of the scale." These researchers conducted a factor analysis and found that the items in the Ball-Rokeach (1973) questionnaire divide into three factors; consequently, the items do represent three separate constructs—violent, defensive and residual attitudes (Kennedy and Forde 1999).

Notwithstanding these limitations, Kennedy and Forde (1999) decided to use these measures in their study of routine conflict. For the purposes of the current study, the fact that the original questions only refer to violence between strangers is not considered problematic as all of the scenarios also refer to strangers. The fact that the Ball-Rokeach (1973) questions only involve males is, however, considered a drawback. Unfortunately, this is a limitation that cannot be avoided and must be taken into account when interpreting the results of this analysis.

Given that these questions have been shown to breakdown into three separate constructs, in order to decide how best to use these items in the current study, reliability analyses were conducted. In examining the constructs separately, the four items that constitute the 'violent attitude' construct achieve an alpha of only .4551 whereas the measure of 'defensive attitudes' achieves an alpha of .6583 (with 3 items) and the residual category an alpha of .5112 (with only two items). Examining all nine items together, the reliability analysis resulted in an alpha of .5915. In comparison to the alpha for the 'defensive attitudes' construct, which only has 3 items, the alpha for all nine items together is lower than anticipated.[31]

Notwithstanding, the decision was made to examine all nine items together. As with *Low Self-control*, the desire for a more parsimonious model was a primary reason behind this research decision. One variable measuring attitudes leads to a less complicated model than three separate variables.. Also, the inclusion of all nine items is a stronger reflection of the variability represented in the scenarios included in the Trials for the present analysis. Depending on the circumstances and intensity level of the various scenarios, the use of violence could be considered 'violent', 'defensive' or perhaps neither. Overall, while it is recognized that the composite scale can be broken down into three constructs, the research objectives of the current research justify the use of a general as opposed to a specific scale.[32]

In terms of the construction of the scale, respondents were asked to respond yes or no to whether or not they would approve of violence in each of the nine situations. Responses were originally coded as yes (1), no (2), 'don't know' (8) and 'no response' (0). For the purposes of the current study these responses were then re-coded as yes (1) and no (0), while 'don't know' and 'no response' were coded as missing. The responses were then added together to form a scale called *Attitudes Towards Violence*, that ranges from 0 (would not tolerate violence in any of the nine circumstances) to 9 (would tolerate violence in all of the nine circumstances); thus, a higher score represents a higher level of tolerance.

Fear of Crime

In the Conflict Questionnaire *Fear of Crime* is measured by asking respondents the question, "*How safe do you feel or* *would* *you feel walking alone in your neighborhood after dark? Would you feel*: very safe (1); reasonably safe (2); somewhat unsafe (3); very unsafe (4)"; or 'don't know' (8). Based on a preliminary analysis of the frequency distribution for this variable, *Fear of Crime* was re-coded to include only three categories by collapsing the final two categories into one category. Thus, the responses for *Fear of Crime* now range from 1 (very safe) to 3 (somewhat unsafe and very unsafe together). In addition, only six respondents fell into the "don't know" category and they were re-coded as missing.

Past Victimization

As a measure of past victimization experience, respondents were questioned about their most serious victimization experience. The question reads, "*What is the most serious thing that has ever happened to you that could be considered a crime?*." Responses to this question were grouped into the following categories: sexual assault (01); robbery (02); assault (03); break and enter (04); motor vehicle theft (05); theft of personal property (06); theft of household property (07); vandalism (08); other victimization (87); never a victim of crime (99); no response (0) and don't know (98).

For the current analysis this variable was re-coded in association with the approximate seriousness of the offence: never a victim of crime (1); other (2); vandalism (3); theft of household property (4); theft of personal property (5); motor vehicle theft (6); break and enter (7); assault (8); robbery (9); sexual assault (10); and finally, no response and don't know are coded as missing.[33] In addition to this re-code of *Past Victimization*, a dummy variable was created where those respondents who report having been a victim of assault are coded as 1 while all other respondents are coded as 0. This variable will be examined to see if having been a victim of assault is related to the use of force in the scenarios as differentiated from other types of victimization.[34]

Independent Variables: Situational Factors

The independent variables discussed below were created separately for each of the four Trials, as described early in this chapter.

Upset (Naming)

Recall that Luckenbill and Doyle's (1989) model of the escalation of disputes includes the steps of *Naming (Upset)*, *Claiming* and *Aggression*. Derived from this model, *Naming* has been operationalized by Kennedy and Forde (1999) as how upset the respondent would be if faced with the circumstances of a particular scenario. Level of upset was originally measured on a scale ranging from 0 (not at all upset) to 10 (extremely upset) (Kennedy and Forde 1996, 1999). For the current analysis this variable has been re-coded to range from 1 (not at all upset) to 11 (extremely upset).

Gender of Harm Doer

In each of the scenarios, respondents were presented with either a male or female harm doer. This variable is treated as a dummy variable where male harm doers are coded as 1 and female harm doers are coded as 0.

Age of Harm Doer

In each of the scenarios, *Age of Harm Doer* is operationalized in terms of three levels, which are 18-year old (1), 35-year old (2), or elderly (3).

Intensity of the Attack

The intensity of each scenario was measured as high, medium or low. However, in terms of wording, the exact operationalization of this variable varies to some extent in accordance with particular scenarios. For example, in the Convenience Store Scenario *Intensity* is operationalized as "yells out loudly" (low = 1), "yells out insulting comments" (medium = 2), and "steps out and pushes" (high = 3). In the Spousal Scenario, *Intensity* is operationalized as "yelling at" (low = 1), "yelling at and insulting" (medium = 2), and "pushing" (high = 3). This variable is ordinal, however, it will be treated as an interval level variable (another option would be to use dummy variables). Although the validity of treating ordinal variables as interval variables is sometimes controversial, this exception is one that is commonly made in social science research.

Respondent Alone

In each scenario the respondent is told that they are either alone or with a friend(s). This variable is also treated as a dummy variable with being alone coded as 1 and not alone coded as 0. As will be illustrated in Chapter Four, in most cases the respondent is with others as opposed to being alone.[35]

Interaction Terms

In addition to the independent variables described above, and in accordance with the hypotheses introduced in Chapter Two, several interaction terms are also included in the model.[36] These interaction terms are: *Gender of Respondent * Gender of Harm Doer * Respondent Alone*;[37] *Gender of Respondent * Upset*; *Age of Respondent * Upset*; *Low Self-control * Intensity*; and, *Gender of Harm Doer * Intensity*.

Centering

Prior to conducting the analyses, all predictor variables in the model that are not dummy variables were centered. Centering involves subtracting the mean of a given variable from that variable. Centering has been used in this model for two reasons. First, centering can ease the interpretation of the effects of the predictor variables, especially in the case of main versus interaction terms, by allowing for the interpretation of main effects as centered at the mean of the other variable included in the interaction term. Second, and more important for this study, models with interaction terms frequently display a high degree of multicollinearity (Sellers 1999). However, transformation of the predictor variables by centering at the mean has been shown to reduce multicollinearity (Sellers, 1999).[38] The variables that were centered are *Age of Respondent*; *Low Self-control*; *Attitudes Towards Violence*; *Fear of Crime*; *Past Victimization*; *Upset*; *Intensity*; and *Age of Harm Doer*.

Summary of the Model

To summarize, the current model includes six respondent characteristics (*Gender of Respondent*, *Age of Respondent*, *Low Self-control*, *Attitudes Towards Violence*, *Fear of*

Crime, and *Past Victimization*); five situational characteristics (*Upset*, *Intensity*, *Gender of Harm Doer*, *Age of Harm Doer*, and *Respondent Alone*); and several interaction terms.

Testing the Hypotheses: Logistic Regression

The interactionist approach adopted in this study entails an examination of interactions among independent variables with regard to their effects on the dependent variable. The current research will apply the principles and methods associated with the interactionist approach to the study of violence in situations of social conflict. Given that the dependent variable is dichotomous, logistic regression is used to test the hypotheses.

Logistic Regression

Binary logistic regression is used to examine the relationship between continuous and noncontinuous predictor variables and a dichotomous dependent or criterion variable. In contrast to linear regression models, logistic regression assumes that the relationship between predictor variables and the criterion variable is nonlinear (Wright 1995). The primary objective of a logistic regression analysis is to predict the probability or *likelihood* of a particular event occurring (George and Mallery 2000; Norusis 1994). More specifically, a logistic regression analysis produces a probability which is then transformed into the odds of an event occurring or not occurring (the ratio of occurrence to nonoccurrence) (Wright 1995; Vogt 1998). In the present study, the odds of a respondent using physical force as a means for dealing with conflict in the scenarios is what is being predicted. It is important to note that logistic regression does not require normally distributed variables, nor does it assume homoscedasticity.[39] Overall, the prerequisites of the logistic regression model are much less restrictive than those of linear regression (Garson 2001).

Clearly it is critical that theory be the primary determinant for the construction of any model; however, there are different mechanisms that can be used to assist in the elimination of predictor variables including forward and backward elimination procedures (Norusis 1994). The current study uses backward elimination to explore the relative contribution of the initial predictors selected for the model. Backward elimination begins with all variables included in the model and then at each step, variables are evaluated in terms of whether or not they should be removed (Norusis 1994). The criterion for removal is "the variable whose likelihood ratio statistic has the largest probability that is greater than alpha" (Grimm and Yarnold 1995: 240). This criterion reflects the fact that that a smaller likelihood ratio statistic indicates a stronger relationship. This process continues until only variables that are statistically significant remain in the model. Again though, theory is the determining force in model construction. In particular, it is critical that all lower-order terms—those that are included in interaction terms—are retained in the model.

With regard to measuring the strength of a logistic regression model, it is important to point out that there is no direct analogue to r-square in OLS regression, although some have tried to create an analogue (Menard 2001). Instead, the *Model Chi-Square* is used to test the *null hypothesis* that all of the coefficients are equal to zero and represents the overall goodness of fit of the model (Norusis 1994). This test does not indicate that every independent variable is significant however. Instead, this test measures difference in error when the independent variables are included in the model as opposed to when they are not. Thus, the *Model Chi-square* indicates the improvement in the fit of the model based on the inclusion of the independent variables. We want this test to be significant at the .05 level or stronger in order to show that the model is significant.

Finally, the logit coefficients and odds ratios will be examined to determine the relative strength of the variables included in the model. The logit coefficients correspond to the unstandardized coefficients in ordinary least squares regression and are used to estimate the odds that the dependent variable is equal to one (Garson 2001). The raw logistic regression coefficients can be interpreted as "the change in log odds associated with a one-unit change in the independent variable" (Norusis 1994: 6).

However, it is easier to think in terms of odds, rather than log odds. Consequently, log odds can be transformed back into an odds ratio (Norusis 1994). The *odds ratio* (OR) "estimates the change in the odds of a membership in the target group for a one-unit increase in the predictor" (Wright 1995: 223). Odds ratios are calculated by using the regression coefficient of a predictor as the exponent of *e*, Exp(b)—*e* raised to the power of B (Wright 1995; Norusis 1994; Vogt 1998).[40] Odds ratios provide a more tangible interpretation of the effects associated with a coefficient. If the coefficient is positive, the factor will be greater than one, indicating an increase in the odds, and if the coefficient is negative, the factor will be less than one, indicating a decrease in the odds (Norusis 1994).[41] Thus, odds ratios will be used to compare the relative contribution of the independent variables to the dependent variable.

Sample Characteristics

This section presents the descriptive statistics for the dependent variable and the predictor variables used in each of the four Trials. The respondent characteristics, which are presented in Table 3.3, include *Gender of Respondent*, *Age of Respondent*, *Low Self-*

Control, *Attitudes Towards Violence*, *Fear of Crime* and *Past Victimization*. Next, the situational factors—*Upset*, *Gender of Harm Doer*, *Age of Harm Doer*, *Intensity* and *Respondent Alone*—will be discussed. Finally, the descriptive statistics for the dependent variable will be presented.

Independent Variables

Table 3.3: Respondent Characteristics (N=2052)

Variable	Missing	Mean	Sd	Kurtosis	Skew	Min	Max
Gender (1 = Male)	0	.49	-	-	-	-	-
Age	32	42	16.5	-.464	.625	18	94
Low Self-Control	270	1.95	.36	.325	.505	1	4
Attitudes	265	3.2	1.7	-.186	.131	0	9
Fear of Crime	6	1.85	.72	-.1073	.228	1	3
Past Victimization	15	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 3.3 shows that, as in the population at large, the gender distribution of respondents in the sample is almost equal—the sample consists of 49.4% males and 50.6% females. Thus, there is a good representation of the population in terms of gender. Next, the mean age for the sample is 42 years with a standard deviation of 16.5 years. The respondents range in age from 18 years (the age required for participating in the study) to 94 years. While this age range is large, the interpretation of the results of this study must consider the fact that people under the age of 18 are excluded. This is important because we know that younger people (e.g., aged 12 to 17) are involved in a fair amount of violence (Baron, Forde, & Kennedy 2001).

The distribution for *Low Self-Control* is positively skewed due to the fact that few respondents reported having very low self-control. On a scale ranging from 1 to 4, with a score of 4 referring to the *lowest* level of self-control that can be reported, the mean for this sample is 1.95 with a standard deviation of .36. Given that this study is based on a sample from the general population, this distribution of self-control is not surprising. More specifically, it was not expected that a large number of individuals would report having low self-control.[42]

With regard to *Attitudes Towards Violence*, on a scale ranging from 0 (would not tolerate violence in any of the nine situations described in Chapter Three) to 9 (would tolerate violence in all of the situations), the mean is 3.2 with a standard deviation of 1.7. This means that most respondents report that they would tolerate the use of violence in at least some sets of circumstances, however, the overall level of tolerance is not high.[43] Next, in terms of *Fear of Crime*, few respondents indicated a high level of fear—the mean score was 1.85 out of 3 with a standard deviation of .72.

Finally, as discussed in this chapter, *Past Victimization* is a nominal level variable and is described in more detail here. Of all respondents, 777 reported that they had never been a victim of crime, while the remaining 1260 reported that they had been a victim of one type of crime or another during their lifetime.[44] Of reported victimization experiences, property offences (and other offences) are the most common, in particular, break and enter, personal theft and motor vehicle theft. For offences against the person, 167 respondents reported having been physically assaulted during their life, while another 75 reported a sexual victimization and 45 respondents said they had been victims of robbery. The frequency distribution for past victimization experiences is presented in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4: Past Victimization

Type of Victimization	f	%
Never a Victim (1)	777	38.14
Other Victimization (2)	237	11.63
Vandalism (3)	90	4.41
Household Theft (4)	40	1.96
Personal Theft (5)	214	10.50
Motor Vehicle Theft (6)	124	6.08
Break and Enter (7)	268	13.15
Assault (8)	167	8.19
Robbery (9)	45	2.20
Sexual Assault (10)	75	3.68
Total	2037	100.0
Missing	15	
Total	2052	

While *Past Victimization* is a nominal level variable, in the logistic regression analyses this variable is treated as a continuous variable. As previously discussed, the categories are designed and ordered to approximate the seriousness of the type of victimization, (although admittedly this approximation is somewhat subjective). It is recognized that the treatment of ranked variables as ordinal is debated, however, generally if there are a significant number of categories this process is tolerated (Vogt 1999). Also discussed was the fact that type of victimization may influence the effect of this variable on the use of force in the scenarios. Consequently, a dummy variable was created whereby those who report having been a victim of assault are coded as 1 while all other respondents are coded as 0. Both of these variables will be examined in the logistic regression analyses.

Situational Factors (N=2052)

Table 3.5: Upset

	Trial							
	One		Two		Three		Four	
Score	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	205	10.03	101	4.95	104	5.09	98	4.81
2	80	3.91	57	2.79	37	1.81	52	2.55
3	178	8.71	107	5.25	125	6.11	140	6.87
4	217	10.62	147	7.21	138	6.75	184	9.03
5	142	6.95	109	5.35	113	5.53	112	5.50
6	397	19.43	275	13.5	322	15.76	345	16.88
7	158	7.73	149	7.31	170	8.32	204	10.01
8	201.	9.83	211	10.35	229	11.20	252	12.37
9	200	9.78	289	14.18	281	13.75	256	12.53
10	73	3.57	155	7.60	126	6.16	89	4.37
11	194	9.49	438	21.50	399	19.53	303	14.88
Total	2043	100	2037	100	2043	100	2036	100
Missing	9		15		9		16	
Total	2052		2052		2052		2052	
Mean	5.98		7.37		7.24		6.86	
Median	6.00		8.00		8.00		7.00	
Mode	6.00		11.00		11.00		6.00	
SD	2.95		2.99		2.92		2.83	
Skew	-.010		-.484		-.420		-.254	
Kurtosis	-.894		-.798		-.747		-.783	

Recall that for reasons previously discussed in this chapter, in contrast to the analyses conducted by Kennedy and Forde (1999), where *Upset* is examined as a dependent variable, *Upset* is used as a predictor variable in the present study. In all Trials, a score of 11 represents the highest level of upset. Table 3.5 shows that the mean level of *Upset* for Trial One is 5.98 with a standard deviation of 2.95. In contrast, the mean level of *Upset* for Trial Two is 7.37 with a standard deviation of 2.99. This number reflects the fact that many respondents reported a high level of upset, while few reported that they would not be upset at all. Of particular interest is the fact that the mode for Trial Two is 11, indicating that a large number of individuals believed that they would be extremely upset if in real life they were faced with the scenario presented to them in Trial Two. As will be discussed further in Chapter Four, this finding indicates possible domain and scenario effects in the Trials.

Similar to Trial Two, the mean for *Upset* in Trial Three is 7.24 with a standard deviation of 2.92. Once again, this higher mean is due to the fact that many respondents reported that they would be very upset. As was the case in Trial Two, Trial Three *Upset* has a mode of 11, indicating that a high number of respondents felt that they would be extremely upset if faced with the situation presented to them in Trial Three. Finally, the mean level of *Upset* for Trial Four is 6.86 with a standard deviation of 2.83. Respondents report that they would less upset in relation to the scenarios they received in Trial Four than the scenarios they were presented with in Trial Two or Trial Three, but still more upset than in Trial One.

With regard to the remaining situational characteristics, recall that the experiment is designed to randomly generate the distribution of these characteristics in the scenarios. This means that if the experiment was successful, *Gender of Harm Doer*, *Age of Harm Doer*, *Level of Intensity* and *Respondent Alone* should be fairly evenly distributed across the scenarios. With the exception of *Respondent Alone*, this is in fact the case (Appendix G). For *Respondent Alone* though, in each of the four Trials respondents are more likely to be in the presence of others as opposed to being alone. This is especially true in Trial Four where a full 73% of respondents are not alone in their scenario (Appendix G).

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this study is *Aggression*, which is operationalized as the willingness to use physical force in each of the four Trials. As previously discussed, Kennedy and Forde (1999) examined 3 dependent variables—*Upset* (Naming), *Claiming* and *Aggression*—which correspond with the model of disputes developed by Luckenbill and Doyle (1989). To place the frequencies for *Aggression* within the context of this model, the table below presents the percentage of respondents who reported that they would be upset, that would make a claim, and that would make a claim *and* use aggression.

Table 3.6: Upset, Claiming and Aggression

Trial	Upset	Claim = No	Claim = Yes	Claim & Aggression = Yes
One	90%	48%	52%	5.5%
Two	95%	28%	72%	17.5%
Three	95%	32%	68%	14%
Four	95%	32%	68%	7%

Table 3.6 demonstrates that while most respondents report that they would be at least somewhat *Upset* in all four Trials, fewer respondents are willing to engage in *Claiming* and even fewer still are willing to engage in the use of force. It is important to note that the percentages for *Aggression* are calculated using the entire sample as the base (N = 2052) rather than just those who responded yes to *Claiming*; however, recall that only those who said yes to *Claiming* were asked about *Aggression*. Consequently, the percentages for *Aggression* reflect the theoretical assumption of Luckenbill and Doyle's (1989) model that *Aggression* will occur only if *Claiming* occurs first. The distribution for *Aggression* in each Trial is presented in more detail below.

Table 3.7: Aggression: Willingness to Use Physical Force

	Trial							
	One		Two		Three		Four	
Force	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0 = No	1930	94.5	1677	82.5	1748	86	1896	93
1 = Yes	113	5.5	359	17.5	292	14	139	7
Total	2042	100.0	2036	100.0	2040	100.0	2036	100.0
Missing	10		16		12		17	
Total	2052		2052		2052		2052	

Table 3.7 shows that only 5.5% of respondents said that they would be willing to use physical force in the given scenario for Trial One. In contrast, in Trial Two, 17.5% of respondents reported that they would be willing to use physical force. Next, in Trial Three, 14% of respondents said that they would be willing to use physical force, while in Trial Four 7% of respondents believed that they would be willing to use physical force in their scenario.

Overall, Trial Two has the highest level of reported willingness to use force, followed by Trial Three, Trial Four and Trial One. Thus, Trial variation in respondents' willingness to use physical force is apparent. What is also apparent is the extreme disproportionality in the response categories for the dependent variable. The majority of respondents report that they would not be willing to use physical force in their scenarios. The disproportionality is most extreme for Trial One and Trial Four. Importantly, Sellers (1999: 393) argues that "the limitations on variation in the dependent variable can reduce the overall predictive power of an explanatory model, even in logistic regression." Thus, the interpretation of the results must take this asymmetry into account.

Chapter Summary

The hypotheses to be tested in this study represent an extension of the analyses conducted by Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999). The analyses will bring together important person factors with situational factors, as well as their interactions. Moreover, by conducting detailed analyses for each of the four Trials, the intricacies of routine conflict management strategies will be exposed. As revealed above, however, it is important to be cognizant of the fact that there is significant variation in the level of willingness to use force by Trial. It is suggested that this variation may in part reflect the variation in the domains and scenarios that constitute the four Trials. This will be explored further in Chapter Four where the results from the logistic regression analyses will be presented and discussed.

CHAPTER FOUR: Logistic Regression Results

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from the logistic regression analyses. As explained in Chapter Three, the effects of the person characteristics, situational factors and their interactions are examined across the four Trials. Subsequent analyses testing for effects associated with domain and scenario will also be discussed.

The initial model included a total of 19 variables. These variables are: *Gender of Respondent*; *Age of Respondent*; *Low Self-control*; *Attitudes Towards Violence*; *Fear of Crime*; *Past Victimization*; *Upset*; *Gender of Harm Doer*; *Age of Harm Doer*; *Intensity*; *Respondent Alone*; *Gender of Respondent * Upset*; *Age of Respondent * Upset*; *Gender of Respondent * Gender of Harm Doer * Respondent Alone*;[45] *Low Self-control * Intensity*; and, *Gender of Harm Doer * Intensity*. This model was run separately for each of the four Trials.

The SPSS output revealed that the *Model Chi-square* was significant in every Trial. Thus, in each case the null hypothesis that all coefficients are equal to zero was rejected. Notwithstanding, there were several variables in each Trial that were not statistically significant. Consequently, backwards elimination was used to determine which variables should be removed from the model. The variables removed from the model in all four Trials were: *Fear of Crime*; *Past Victimization*[46]; *Gender * Gender * Alone*; *Gender of Respondent * Alone*; *Gender of Harm Doer * Alone*; *Gender Respondent * Intensity*; *Self-control * Intensity*; and, *Gender of Respondent * Upset*. The implication of the removal of these variables is that a number of the hypotheses introduced in Chapter Two must be rejected at the outset. Specifically, no support has been found for Hypotheses Ten (*Gender * Gender * Alone*), Twelve (*Gender of Harm Doer * Intensity*), Thirteen (*Gender of Respondent * Upset*), and Fifteen (*Self-control * Intensity*). Also, *Fear of Crime* and *Past Victimization* were found to have no significant effects on the willingness to use force.

All variables that were significant in at least one of the four Trials are included in the final model. This final model was run separately for each of the four Trials and is used to compare the effects of the independent variables on these four separate occasions. The results of this comparison are presented in Table 4.1.

Comparing the Four Trials

Table 4.1: Coefficients and Odds Ratios

	Trial			
Variable	One	Two	Three	Four
	N=1558	*N=1552*	*N=1552*	*N=1555*
Gender of Respondent	B = -.058 Exp(B) .944	B = .333 Exp(B) 1.395	B = .458 Exp(B) 1.581	B = .389 Exp(B) 1.475
Age of Respondent	B = .005 Exp(B) 1.005	B = .003 Exp(B) 1.003	B = -.007 Exp(B) .993	B = .012 Exp(B) 1.012
Low Self-control	B = .676* Exp(B) 1.965	B = -.038 Exp(B) .963	B = .085 Exp(B) 1.088	B = .937** Exp(B) 2.553
Attitudes Towards Violence	B = .283*** Exp(B) 1.327	B = .124** Exp(B) 1.132	B = .093 Exp(B) 1.098	B = .107 Exp(B) 1.113
Upset	B = .263*** Exp(B) 1.300	B = .250*** Exp(B) 1.284	B = .368*** Exp(B) 1.445	B = .236*** Exp(B) 1.267
Intensity	B = .621*** Exp(B) 1.862	B = .386*** Exp(B) 1.471	B = .868*** Exp(B) 2.381	B = .224 Exp(B) 1.251
Respondent Alone	B = -.182 Exp(B) .833	B = -.094 Exp(B) .910	B = -.227 Exp(B) .797	B = -.612* Exp(B) .542
Age of Harm Doer	B = -.476** Exp(B) .621	B = .189* Exp(B) 1.208	B = -.064 Exp(B) .938	B = -.074 Exp(B) .928
Gender of Harm Doer	B = .058 Exp(B) 1.060	B = -.568** Exp(B) .567	B = .151 Exp(B) 1.163	B = .077 Exp(B) 1.080
Age of Respondent * Upset	B = -.011*** Exp(B) .990	B = -.001 Exp(B) .999	B = -.002 Exp(B) .998	B = -.008** Exp(B) .992
Gender * Gender	B = 1.517* Exp(B) 4.559	B = .839** Exp(B) 2.315	B = .830* Exp(B) 2.293	B = 1.030* Exp(B) 2.800

***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<.05

Interpretation of the Results

First of all, it can be seen from the Trial *N*'s that there is a significant number of missing cases for each Trial. Upon review of the descriptive statistics it was confirmed that the missing cases are a reflection of the large number of missing cases for the variables *Low Self-control* and *Attitudes Towards Violence*. As a result, for each Trial, steps were taken to determine whether or not the missing cases on these variables would be substantively detrimental to the model. First, a dummy variable was created for each of the two variables where missing cases were coded as 1 and all other cases were coded as 0. Second, new variables were created for *Low Self-control* and *Attitudes Towards Violence* where the mean for each of these variables was assigned to the missing cases. Next, the model was rerun for each Trial with the dummy variables and the new variables for *Low Self-control* and *Attitudes Towards Violence*. This process revealed that neither of the dummy variables was significant, suggesting that the missing cases for *Low Self-control* and *Attitudes Towards Violence* do not differ substantially from the included cases. Consequently, it was determined that the missing cases for *Low Self-control* and *Attitudes Towards Violence* do not pose a threat to the model.

In terms of the overall strength of this final model, the *Model Chi-square* was significant for every Trial. This means that the null hypothesis that all of the coefficients are equal to zero is rejected for each of the four Trials. Nonetheless, in terms of the strength and significance of the coefficients, Table 4.1 demonstrates that there is variation across the four Trials. The initial interpretation of the coefficients presented here will be primarily descriptive. A much more detailed discussion of the results will be offered in Chapter Five.

Person Characteristics

With regard to person characteristics, neither *Gender of Respondent* nor *Age of Respondent* are significant in any of the four Trials. This means that on their own, the gender and age of the respondent do not have a statistically significant effect on the odds of a respondent using force in the scenarios. In view of past research, these findings are surprising. In contrast, *Low Self-control* has a significant effect on the willingness to use force, but only in Trial One and in Trial Four. In Trial One, *Low Self-control* increases the odds that the respondent will use physical force by a factor of 1.965 (B=.676*). In Trial four the effects are even greater—having low self-control increases the odds of force by a factor of 2.553 (B=.937*). Finally, *Attitudes Towards Violence* is statistically significant in Trial One and Trial Two only. In both of these Trials, a respondent who reports a higher tolerance of the use of violence is more likely to say that they would use physical force in the scenarios. The effect of *Attitudes Towards Violence* is slightly greater in Trial One (B=.283***; Exp(B) = 1.327) than in Trial Two (B=.124**; Exp(B) = 1.132).

Situational Factors

In terms of situational factors, *Upset* has a significant effect on the odds that a respondent will be willing to use physical force as a means for dealing with conflict across all four Trials. In every Trial, as respondents become more upset, the odds that they will use force increase. The effects of *Upset* are greatest in Trial Three (B=.368***; Exp(B) = 1.445). Next, *Intensity* has a significant effect in all but Trial Four. In the first three Trials as the intensity of the situation increases, the odds that force will be used also increase. Similar to *Upset*, the effect of *Intensity* is significantly greater in Trial Three (B=.868***; Exp(B) = 2.381) than in the other Trials.

In contrast to *Intensity*, which is significant in all but Trial Four, *Respondent Alone* is significant in Trial Four only. In that Trial, if the respondent is alone in their situation as opposed to with others, the odds that they will use force as a means for dealing with conflict decreases (B= -.612*; Exp(B) = .542). Next, *Age of Harm Doer* is significant in Trial One and Trial Two, but not in Trial Three or Trial Four. What is peculiar about this variable, is that in Trial One the coefficient is negative, while in Trial Two the coefficient is positive. This means that in Trial One, as *Age of Harm Doer* increases, the odds that the respondent will use physical force decreases (B= -.476**; Exp(B) = .621). In contrast, in Trial Two, as *Age of Harm Doer* increases so do the odds that force will be used as a means for dealing with the conflict (B=.189*; Exp(B) = 1.208). Finally, *Gender of Harm Doer* is only significant in Trial Two. In that Trial, when the harm doer is a male, the odds that the respondent will use physical force decreases (B= -568**; Exp(B) = .567).

Interaction Terms

The interaction between *Age of Respondent* and *Upset* was found to be significant in Trial One (B= -.011***; Exp(B) = .990) and Trial Four (B= -.008**; Exp(B) = .992) only. In contrast, the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* has a significant effect on the willingness to use physical force in all four Trials. Notably, the effects of this interaction term are significantly greater in Trial One (B=1.517*; Exp(B) = 4.559) than in the other three Trials. Both of these interaction terms are discussed in more detail below.

Age of Respondent * Upset

Table 4.2 illustrates the nature of the interaction between *Age of Respondent* and *Upset* for Trial One and Trial Four. For ease of interpretation, the categories for *Age of Respondent* and *Upset* have been collapsed.

Table 4.2: Yes to Use Force by Age of Respondent and Upset

	Trial			
	One (N = 2037)		Four (N = 2031)	
Age of Respondent	Not Highly Upset	Highly Upset	Not Highly Upset	Highly Upset
18-39	3.2% (N=688)	13.9% (N=345)	3.4% (N=582)	13.1% (N=450)
40+	2.2% (N=684)	8.4% (N=320)	4.2% (N=549)	8.4% (N=450)

It is evident from Table 4.2 that in both Trial One and Trial Four most respondents are less likely to use physical force when they are not highly upset and are more likely to use physical force when they are highly upset. However, the effect of *Upset* on the willingness to use force varies by age category in that of those individuals who are highly upset, younger individuals are more likely than older individuals to report that they would be willing to use physical force in the scenarios.

Gender of Respondent by Gender of Harm Doer

Table 4.3: Trial One Yes to Force (N = 2043)

	Harm Doer	
Respondent	Male	Female
Male	12.1% (N=621)	2.8% (N=388)
Female	3.0% (N=607)	2.1% (N=427)

Table 4.4: Trial Two Yes to Force (N=2034)

	Harm Doer	
Respondent	Male	Female
Male	24.9% (N=494)	17.3% (N=509)
Female	11.7% (N=497)	16.7% (N=534)

Table 4.5: Trial Three Yes to Force (N=2039)

	Harm Doer	
Respondent	Male	Female
Male	25.9% (N=510)	11% (N=498)
Female	11.9% (N=522)	8.4% (N=509)

Table 4.6: Trial Four Yes to Force (N=2035)

	Harm Doer	
Respondent	Male	Female
Male	14.4% (N=430)	5.7% (N=576)
Female	3.9% (N =408)	4.3% (N=621)

Table 4.3 shows that in Trial One both males and females are more likely to use force against a male harm doer. However, compared to female respondents, male respondents are much more willing to use physical force against a male harm doer than a female harm doer. In contrast, the gender of the harm doer is not as significant for female respondents as it is for male respondents.

In Trial Two (Table 4.4), male respondents are again more likely to use force against a male harm doer; however, the difference by *Gender of Harm Doer* is not as great in this Trial as it was in Trial One. In addition, in contrast to Trial One, female respondents are somewhat more likely to use aggression against a female harm doer as opposed to a male harm doer in Trial Two.

In Trial Three (Table 4.5), male respondents are more than twice as likely to be willing to use physical force against a male harm doer as compared to a female harm doer. While female respondents are also more likely to say that they would use force against a male harm doer, the difference in the use of force by *Gender of Harm Doer* is not as great as it is for male respondents.

Finally, Table 4.6 shows that in Trial Four, once again male respondents are more than twice as likely to use aggression against another male as compared to a female harm doer. In contrast, female respondents are slightly more likely to use violence against a female harm doer, as was the case in Trial Two.

These four tables illustrate that while there is some variation in the nature and strength of the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* in relation to the use of physical force, gender-dynamic is critical to understanding the processes associated with violence. Given the predominance of this dynamic, along with the central interest of this study in gender similarities and differences in the relative significance of person and situation characteristics more broadly, the effects of gender need to be examined in even greater detail. Thus, in addition to the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer*, all other possible interactions between *Gender of Respondent* and the variables in the final model were tested for all four Trials.

Gender, Person and Situation Interactions

These analyses revealed only two significant interactions and both of these relationships were found in Trial Three. In Trial Three there was a significant interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Attitudes Towards Violence* (B = -.223*; Exp(B)=.800), as well as between *Gender of Respondent* and *Intensity* (B = -.628**; Exp(B)=.534). These interaction terms are illustrated below.

Table 4.7: Trial Three Yes to Force by Gender and Attitudes (N=1779)

	Approval of Violence	
Respondent Gender	Lower	Higher
Male	17.6% (N=415)	18.6% (N=483)
Female	8.7% (N=572)	13.6% (N=309)

Table 4.7 shows that both male and female respondents who report a higher approval of violence are more likely to report that they would be willing to use physical force in Trial Three. Interestingly however, there is a much greater difference in willingness to use force by *Attitudes Towards Violence* for female respondents as compared to male respondents. Female respondents who report a higher approval of violence are much more likely to say that they would be willing to use physical force than are those female respondents who report a lower rate of approval of violence. In contrast, there is very little difference in willingness to use force for male respondents on the basis of *Attitudes Towards Violence*.

Table 4.8: Trial Three Yes to Force by Gender and Intensity (N=2041)

	Intensity		
Respondent Gender	Low	Medium	High
Male	10.5% (N=352)	12.2% (N=319)	32.8% (N=338)
Female	3.4% (N=324)	4.3% (N=374)	23.4% (N=334)

Table 4.8 reveals that both male and female respondents are more likely to report that they would be willing to use physical force as the level of intensity increases. In addition, at each level of intensity male respondents are more likely than female respondents to say that they would be willing to use force as a means for dealing with conflict. Overall though, willingness to use force is greatest when the respondent is male and the level of intensity is high.

It is not clear why these two interaction terms were only significant in Trial Three. As shown in Chapter three, the scenarios in Trial Three are drawn primarily from the Domestic Domain. Consequently, it was at first speculated that these interaction terms might be reflective of differential effects of *Gender of Respondent* within the

Domestic Domain as compared to other social domains. As will be seen shortly, however, subsequent analyses do not support this proposition.

Summary

The analyses thus far have not exhibited what was expected—a greater level of consistency in the effects of person and situation factors across Trials. It was learned in the original study by Kennedy and Forde (1999) that willingness to use physical force varies by social domain and by scenario, (although these authors did not thoroughly examine variation in the effects of person and situation variables by domain or scenario).[47] This raises the possibility that variation in the effects of person and situation factors across the Trials is at least in part a reflection of effects associated with domain and scenario. Given this possibility, further analysis is required to test for these potential effects.

Willingness to Use Force by Social Domain and Scenario

This section examines the effects of person and situation variables in conjunction with the effects of domain and scenario. To begin, the frequency of reported willingness to use physical force by domain is presented in Table 4.9 below.

Table 4.9: Willingness to Use Physical Force by Domain

Domain	Yes	N
Work	4.5%	1589
Street	19.1%	1585
Domestic	12.1%	1588
Leisure	8.0%	1583

Table 4.9 shows clear differences in the willingness of respondents to use physical force across social domains. Respondents are most likely to report that they would be willing to use force in the Street Domain (19.1%), followed by the Domestic

Domain (12.1%) and the Leisure Domain (8%). Respondents report that they are least likely to use force in the Work Domain (4.5%).[48]

In addition to domain, an examination of the willingness of respondents to use force at the level of specific scenarios reveals further significant differences.

Table 4.10: Willingness to Use Force by Scenario

Scenario	Yes	N
Schoolyard	7.9%	498
Worker	4.1%	509
Customer	1.9%	582
Convenience Store	12.6%	487
Robbery	43.5%	509
Traffic Accident	3.5%	589
Spousal	14.8%	526
Child	19.5%	568
Neighbor	.6%	494
Sporting Event	11.6%	503
Pub	9.6%	533
Vacation	3.1%	547

Table 4.10 illustrates that by far, respondents are most willing to use physical force in the Robbery Scenario (Appendix B). A total of 43.5% of respondents reported that they would be willing to use physical force in that situation. The next greatest level of willingness to use force is found in the Child Scenario, where 19.5% of respondents reported that they would be willing to use force. In contrast, respondents are least likely to use force in the Neighbor Scenario (Appendix B). Less than 01% of respondents said that they would be willing to use physical force as a means for dealing with conflict in this situation. Similarly, very few respondents said that they would be willing to use physical force in the Customer Scenario.

In sum, along with the variation in the effects of person and situation factors across Trials, Table 4.9 and Table 4.10 reveal that there are clear differences in the willingness to use force both at the level of domain and at the level of scenarios. Consequently, it is logical to examine variation in the effects of person and situation factors in concert with these effects.

Exploring the Effects of Domain and Scenario

In order to explore the effects associated with domain, a dummy variable was created to represent domain in each of the four Trials. For example, in Trial One, scenarios representing the Work Domain, were coded as one, while the remaining scenarios were coded as zero. In Trial Two, scenarios representing the Street Domain were coded as one and the remaining scenarios coded as zero. In Trial Three, scenarios representing the Domestic Domain were coded as one and the remaining scenarios coded as zero. Finally, in Trial Four, scenarios representing the Leisure Domain were coded as one, while the remaining scenarios were coded as zero.

Next, a dummy variable was created to represent each of the three scenarios from each domain. For example, in Trial One, these scenarios include the Schoolyard Scenario, the Worker Scenario and the Customer Scenario. In each case one scenario of interest is coded as one, while all other scenarios are coded as zero. The scenario resulting in the greatest level of force within each domain will be presented in tables for the corresponding Trials to illustrate scenario effects. These scenarios are the Schoolyard Scenario (Trial One), the Robbery Scenario (Trial Two), the Child Scenario (Trial Three), and the Sporting Event Scenario (Trial Four).

Four tables have been created to address two primary objectives. First, these tables have been designed to illustrate and summarize the relative contribution of respondent characteristics and situational factors, as well as their interactions, for each of the four Trials. Second, these tables show how these effects change or do not change when social domain, and then scenario, are added to each of the Trials. Thus, the primary interest of this analysis is the relative strength of the person and situation factors, and the interaction terms (with special interest in the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer*), in the presence of domain and scenario effects.

Table 4.11: Trial One

Variable	Fixed Respondent Characteristics	Upset	Gender of Harm Doer	Additional Respondent and Situation Factors	Social Domain	Scenario
Gender = Male	B = .701**	B =1.089***	B =1.046***	B = -.058	B = -.112	B = -.147 Exp(b)=.863
Age of Respondent = Older	B = -.014	B = -.015	B = -.014	B = .005	B = .004	B = .004 Exp(b)=1.004
Low Self-control	B = .583*	B = .347	B = .437	B = .676*	B = .676*	B = .712* Exp(b)=2.037
Positive Attitudes Towards Violence	B = .283***	B = .266***	B = .269***	B = .283***	B = .283***	B = .287*** Exp(b)=1.333
Upset		B = .337***	B = .321***	B = .263***	B = .256***	B = .247*** Exp(b)=1.280
Gender of Harm Doer = Male			B = .958**	B = .058	B =-.003	B = -.071 Exp(b)=.932
Intensity				B = .621***	B = .633***	B = .640*** Exp(b)=1.896
Age of Harm Doer				B = -.476**	B = -.474**	B = -.503** Exp(b)=.605
Respondent Alone				B = -.182	B = -.069	B = -.048 Exp(b)=.953
Gender * Gender				B = 1.517*	B = 1.530*	B = 1.592** Exp(b)=4.914
Age * Upset				B = -.011***	B = -.011***	B = -.011*** Exp(b)=.989
Work Domain					B = -.597* Exp(B)=.551	B = -.969** Exp(B)=.379
Schoolyard Scenario						B = .833** Exp(B)=2.300

***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<.05

Table 4.12: Trial Two

Variable	Fixed Respondent Characteristics	Upset	Gender of Harm Doer	Additional Respondent and Situation Factors	Social Domain	Scenario
Gender = Male	B = .419**	B = .751***	B = .754***	B = .333	B = .336	B = .511* Exp(b)=1.667
Age of Respondent = Older	B = .000	B = .000	B = .000	B = .003	B = .002	B = .002 Exp(b)=1.002
Low Self-control	B = .146	B = -.073	B = -.074	B = -.038	B = -.049	B = .090 Exp(b)=1.094
Positive Attitudes Towards Violence	B = .168***	B = .125**	B = .125**	B = .124**	B = .126**	B = .198*** Exp(b)=1.218
Upset		B = .263***	B = .265***	B = .250***	B = .243***	B = .164*** Exp(b)=1.178
Gender of Harm Doer = Male			B = -.090	B = -.568**	B = -.531*	B = .-308 Exp(b)=.735
Intensity				B = .386***	B = .390***	B = .526*** Exp(b)=1.692
Age of Harm Doer				B = .189*	B = .151	B = .136 Exp(b)=1.146
Respondent Alone				B = -.094	B = -.138	B = .013 Exp(b)=1.013
Gender * Gender				B = .839**	B = .899**	B = .760* Exp(b)=2.138
Age * Upset				B = -.001	B = -.001	B = -.001 Exp(b)=.999
Street Domain					B = .600** Exp(B)=1.822	B = -423 Exp(B)=.655
Robbery Scenario						B = 2.312*** Exp(B)=10.095

***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<.05

Table 4.13: Trial Three

Variable	Fixed Respondent Characteristics	Upset	Gender of Harm Doer	Additional Respondent and Situation Factors	Social Domain	Scenario
Gender = Male	B = .470**	B = .932***	B = .917***	B = .458	B = .469	B = .416 Exp(b)=1.516
Age of Respondent = Older	B = -.010*	B = -.013**	B = -.013*	B = -.007	B = -.007	B = -.006 Exp(b)=.994
Low Self-control	B = .128	B = .072	B = .082	B = .085	B = .101	B = .115 Exp(b)=1.122
Positive Attitudes Towards Violence	B = .086	B = .079	B = .076	B = .093	B = .095	B = .097 Exp(b)=1.102
Upset		B = .417***	B = .403***	B = .368***	B = .359***	B = .318*** Exp(b)=1.374
Gender of Harm Doer = Male			B = .559***	B = .151	B = .149	B = .296 Exp(b)=1.344
Intensity				B = .868***	B = .907***	B = .947*** Exp(b)=2.578
Age of Harm Doer				B = -.064	B = -.034	B = -.007 Exp(b)=.993
Respondent Alone				B = -.227	B = -.052	B = -.027 Exp(b)=.974
Gender * Gender				B = .830*	B = .759*	B = .826* Exp(b)=2.283
Age * Upset				B = -.002	B = -.002	B = -.002 Exp(b)=.998
Domestic Domain					B = -.681*** Exp(B)=.506	B = -1.130*** Exp(B)=.323
Child Scenario						B = .931*** Exp(B)=2.536

***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<.05

Table 4.14: Trial Four

Variable	Fixed Respondent Characteristics	Upset	Gender of Harm Doer	Additional Respondent and Situation Factors	Social Domain	Scenario
Gender = Male	B = .672**	B= .924***	B = .916***	B = .389	B = .382	B = .360 Exp(b)=1.434
Age of Respondent = Older	B = .003	B = .001	B = .002	B =.012	B = .011	B =.012 Exp(b)=1.012
Low Self-control	B = 1.055***	B= .948***	B = .972***	B = .937**	B = .912**	B = .942** Exp(b)=2.566
Positive Attitudes Towards Violence	B = .151*	B = .115	B = .118	B = .107	B = .113	B = .119 Exp(b)=1.126
Upset		B =.239***	B = .230***	B = .236***	B = .227***	B = .227*** Exp(b)=1.254
Gender of Harm Doer = Male			B = .616**	B = .077	B = .068	B = .208 Exp(b)=1.232
Intensity				B = .224	B = .234	B = .218 Exp(b)=1.243
Age of Harm Doer				B = -.074	B = -.052	B = -.146 Exp(b)=.864
Respondent Alone				B = -.612*	B = -.737**	B = -.898** Exp(b)=.407
Gender * Gender				B = 1.030*	B = 1.048*	B = 1.021* Exp(b)=2.776
Age * Upset				B = -.008**	B = -.008**	B = -.008** Exp(b)=.992
Leisure Domain					B = 1.148** Exp(B)=3.153	B = .792* Exp(B)=2.207
Sport Scenario						B = .925*** Exp(B)=2.522

***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<.05

Discussion

Table 4.11 shows that the addition of *Work Domain*, and then *Schoolyard Scenario* does not significantly alter the effects of the person and situation variables included in the analysis; however, both of these variables are significant.[49] The final column in Table 4.11 shows that the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* (B=1.592**; Exp(B)=4.914) is the strongest variable in the model. This interaction term is stronger in its effects on willingness to use force than is *Work Domain* (B= -.969**; Exp(B)=.379) or *Schoolyard Scenario* (B=.833**; Exp(B)=2.300). It is important to note as well that *Low Self-control* and *Intensity* are actually stronger than *Work Domain*, but not as strong as *Schoolyard Scenario* in this Trial. In sum, *Work Domain* and *Schoolyard Scenario* have a significant effect on the odds that a respondent will be willing to use physical force in Trial One; however, the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* is by far the most significant variable in the model. In addition, *Low Self-control* and *Intensity* are among the top five predictors in Trial One.

Table 4.12 shows that *Street Domain* is significant only when *Robbery Scenario* is excluded from the model. Moreover, the addition of *Street Domain* does not significantly alter the effects of the other variables in the model. In contrast, the final column in Table 4.12 shows that *Robbery Scenario* (B=2.312**; Exp(B)=10.095) is by far the most significant variable in the model while *Street Domain* (B=-.423; Exp(B)=.655) is no longer significant.[50] Further, the inclusion of *Robbery Scenario* alters the effects of some of the other variables in the model. In particular, *Gender of Respondent* becomes significant (males are more likely to be willing to use force than females), and *Gender of Harm Doer* is no longer significant. Notably, however, the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* (B=.760*; Exp(B)=2.138) remains significant when domain and scenario are included in the model. This means that when *Robbery Scenario* is included in the model, *Gender of Respondent* has both main and interactive effects on the willingness of respondents to use force. Moreover, the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* is stronger than all other variables in Trial Two, with the exception of *Robbery Scenario*.

Table 4.13 shows that in Trial Three, the addition of *Domestic Domain*, and then *Child Scenario*, does not significantly alter the effects of the person and situation factors in the model; however, once again both of these variables are significant.[51] The final column in Table 4.13 reveals that *Intensity* (B=.947***; Exp(B)=2.578) is the most significant variable in the model, followed closely by *Child Scenario* (B=.931***; Exp(B)=2.536), the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* (B=.826*; Exp(B)= 2.283) and *Domestic Domain* (B= -1.130***; Exp(B) =.323) Overall, while *Intensity* is the strongest variable, the effects of *Child Scenario* are nearly as great. In addition, the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer*, and *Domestic Domain* remain among the top predictors in Trial Three.

Finally, Table 4.14 reveals that in Trial Four, both *Leisure Domain* (B=.792*; Exp(B)=2.207) and *Sport Scenario* (B=.925***; Exp(B)=2.522) are significant.[52] Table 4.14 also shows that the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* (B=1.021*; Exp(B)=2.776) is the most significant variable in the model and that it remains significant in the presence of the effect of *Leisure Domain* and *Sport Scenario*. Interestingly, in this Trial *Low Self-control* is stronger than *Leisure Domain* and *Sport Scenario*, but not as strong as the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer*.

Looking at the four Trials together, the influence of social domain, scenario, and the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* in relation to the willingness of respondents to use force is indisputable. With regard to domain, in Trial One, *Work Domain* has a negative effect on the odds of force. In contrast, in Trial Two, *Street Domain* has a positive effect on the odds of force; however, this variable is not significant when *Robbery Scenario* is added to the model. Next, in Trial Three, *Domestic Domain* decreases the odds of force, while in Trial Four, *Leisure Domain* increases the odds of force. These results indicate that social domain plays a considerable role in determining respondents' willingness to use physical force as means for dealing with conflict.

Looking at the effects of individual scenarios, the importance of situation in the social processes associated with violence is plainly evident. This is especially true in Trial Two, where *Robbery Scenario* increases the odds of force by a factor of 10.095 (B=2.312***). In fact, this is the most powerful effect found in all of the four Trials. As can be seen from the tables though, all of the other scenarios that have been highlighted also have a significant effect on the odds of force. These analyses demonstrate that along with person characteristics such as *Low Self-control*, and situational factors such as *Intensity*, the circumstances of conflict are important to whether or not an individual will be willing to use physical force.

Last but not least, the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* remains significant when domain and scenario are added to the model in every Trial. Interestingly, this interaction term is much stronger in Trial One than in the other Trials. Regardless of this variation in strength however, these analyses reveal the overwhelming significance of gender-dynamic in the processes associated with violence—even when the effects of domain and scenario are taken into account. Gender-dynamic continues to be of much greater significance than the *Gender of Respondent* (a person characteristic) or the *Gender of Harm Doer* (a situational factor) alone.

Altogether, these findings indicate that gender-dynamic, domain, and scenario are all fundamental factors associated with the willingness of individuals to use physical force as a means for dealing with conflict. These findings further uphold the critical role of situation in relation to violence as one possible outcome of disputes. Given that all of these factors make a powerful contribution to the explanation of violence, it makes sense to test for the possibility of interaction effects among *Gender of Respondent*, *Gender of Harm Doer*, domain and scenario.

Gender, Domain and Scenario

To test for the possibility of a three-way interaction between gender-dynamic and domain, as well as interactions between *Gender of Respondent* and domain, and *Gender of Harm Doer* and domain, these interaction terms were created and examined for each of the four Trials. This process revealed only one significant interaction term and it exists in Trial Two.[53] In Trial Two there is a significant interaction between *Gender of Harm Doer* and *Street Domain* (B= -.926*; Exp(B)=.396). This interaction effect indicates that within the *Street Domain* respondents are slightly more willing to use physical force against a female harm doer as opposed to a male harm doer. Recall that the Trial Two analyses presented earlier, those which did not account for domain, produced the same result. Altogether, these findings imply that there is a relationship between *Gender of Respondent*, *Gender of Harm Doer* and *Street Domain*. As stated however, the three-way interaction term was not significant.

Similar to the process described above, interaction terms were created to test for the possibility of interaction effects between gender-dynamic and scenario, *Gender of Respondent* and scenario, and *Gender of Harm Doer* and scenario. For each of the four Trials, the scenario resulting in the greatest amount of respondent willingness to use force was selected for analysis. These scenarios are the Schoolyard Scenario, the Robbery Scenario, the Child Scenario, and the Sport Scenario.

These analyses produced two significant interaction terms and both are found in the results for the Robbery Scenario in Trial Two. Significant interactions were found between *Gender of Respondent* and *Robbery Scenario* (B =.697*; Exp(B)=2.007), as well as between *Gender of Harm Doer* and *Robbery Scenario* (B= -1.017**; Exp(B)=.362); however, the three-way interaction term was not significant. The first interaction term (*Gender of Respondent* by *Robbery Scenario*) reflects the fact that willingness to use force is most likely when the respondent is male and the scenario is the Robbery Scenario in Trial Two. The second interaction term (*Gender of Harm Doer* by *Robbery Scenario*) indicates that the effects of *Gender of Harm Doer* vary by scenario in Trial Two. Specifically, respondents are less likely to use physical force against a female harm doer in scenarios other than the Robbery Scenario in Trial Two; however, in the Robbery Scenario, female harm doers are more likely to be the targets of force than male harm doers.[54]

Overall, the analyses conducted to further probe the relationships among *Gender of Respondent*, *Gender of Harm Doer*, domain and scenario support the fact that all of these variables have a significant impact on the willingness of respondents to use physical force. However, with the exception of the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* the effects are not generally interactive.

Chapter Summary

A review of the hypotheses introduced in Chapter Two reveals variation across the four Trials. In fact, *Upset* (Hypotheses 5) and the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* (Hypothesis 11) are the only hypotheses that are supported in all four Trials. Moreover, the predominance of the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* is by far the most significant finding. The fact that this interaction is relatively consistent in its effects when most other variables are not indicates the notable significance of gender in relation to the processes associated with violence. Notwithstanding the fact that *Gender of Respondent* by itself is not statistically significant in any of the four Trials and *Gender of Harm Doer* is only significant in one Trial (due to the presence of the interaction term), gender is crucial to understanding violence. Essentially, this result indicates that in contrast to most past research in relation to gender and violence, it is just as important, if not more important, to understand gender at the situational level of analysis than at the individual level of analysis. Rather than looking only at the gender of individuals involved in violent encounters, gender-dynamic must also be a primary focus in studies of violence. As discussed, this assertion has critical implications for the research questions that are posed, and therefore, the explanations that are developed with regard to the relationship between gender and violence.

This chapter has further examined the relative effects of person characteristics and situation factors in conjunction with social domain and scenario on the willingness of individuals to use physical force as a means for dealing with conflict. Special attention has also been paid to the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer*. Notably, the results show that the significance of gender-dynamic persists in the presence of domain and scenario effects. The analyses also reveal, however, that domain and scenario are among the strongest variables in the model in every Trial. Significantly, the implication of this finding is that the inconsistencies in the effects of person and situation variables across Trials can at least in part be explained by domain and scenario effects.

For example, a young male with low self-control who expresses a tolerance for violence may not use violence towards another young male within the *Work Domain*, but may select this option in the *Leisure Domain*. One possible explanation for this is that the Leisure Domain is more informal than the Work Domain, and therefore, may offer different social rules for interaction. For another example, at the level of scenario, within the *Work Domain* this same individual might use violence as a means for dealing with conflict in the *Schoolyard Scenario* but may not do so in the *Worker Scenario*—perhaps for fear of losing their job. This means that regardless of our person characteristics, or the specific situational factors that are present (such as *Gender of Harm Doer*), the social context within which conflicts occur have an impact on whether or not physical force will be considered as an option. In some situations, individuals who would not normally use violence may select this option because they perceive no viable alternative—in the Robbery Scenario for example. In other cases, social norms associated with particular sets of circumstances (e.g., the Worker Scenario) may constrain the responses of individuals whom we might consider to be more *violence prone*—those with low self-control for instance.

Altogether, the analyses in this chapter demonstrate the significance of situation—in the form of gender-dynamic, domain and scenario—for understanding why an individual may decide to use physical force as a means for dealing with conflict. Individuals enter into social interactions—conflict oriented or otherwise—with a particular combination of person characteristics that influence how they interpret and respond to particular situations. Once in these situations, individuals are faced with a number of social cues, such as the gender of the other person or the presence of bystanders, which further inform their behavioural response. In addition however, the choices that are made with regard to dealing with conflict are influenced by social domain, and more specifically, by the characteristics of a particular scenario. Thus, in order to understand why conflict sometimes results in violence, it is critical to understand the contribution of all of these important factors.

CHAPTER FIVE: Summary and Conclusions

Introduction

This study has examined the relative contribution of person characteristics and situational factors in relation to the use of violence as a means for dealing with conflict. To date, much of the research on violence has been preoccupied with the characteristics of individual offenders and has clearly neglected situational factors. In contrast, this study has integrated these two levels of analyses for the purpose of better understanding the escalation of conflict situations in to violence. Significantly, emphasis has been placed on the combined and interaction effects of both person and situational factors. More specifically, an interactionist position has been adopted to address the following question: "*How do individual differences and situations interact in evoking behaviour*" (Endler 1981: 241). In addition, the effects of gender have been a central theme in this research. The objective of this study has been to achieve a greater comprehension of why certain individuals behave violently in certain situations. This integrated analysis of violence has been directed by routine conflict theory.

Review of the Theoretical Framework

As discussed, routine conflict theory suggests that individuals enter into situations of social interaction with certain expectations as to how those interactions will proceed—both in terms of their own behaviour and the behaviour of others. These social expectations take the form of rules and norms that have been acquired through socialization, which then inform behaviour as well as the interpretation and response to the behaviour of others.

Routine conflict theory says that social expectations are embodied in socially constructed scripts for behaviour, which vary in terms of person characteristics such as gender and age. When an individual enters into a social situation, these behavioural scripts act as a cognitive framework for the interpretation and response to circumstances. Critically, situational factors such as the gender and age of the other party and whether or not there are bystanders present, act as social cues that trigger particular scripts for behaviour.

Routine conflict theory further suggests that scripts will become *routine* in the sense that similar situations should invoke similar responses. With regard to the use of physical force in conflict situations, individuals have social expectations regarding when, where and against who the use of physical force is appropriate or tolerated. Altogether, routine conflict theory says that individuals who are faced with conflict will draw on behavioural scripts on the basis of situational cues—just as they draw on scripts for behaviour in non-conflict situations.

Routine conflict theory has been used as the primary framework for addressing the following research questions. First, what individual level variables are related to the use of violence during the context of an interpersonal dispute? Second, what situational factors are related to the use of violence? Third, what combination of individual and situational factors is likely to result in a violent response? In addition, what significant interaction effects exist among these variables? Finally, this study has examined the overall effects of gender in relation to these research questions.

Summary of Research Findings

The most significant research findings and their implications are discussed below.

Person Characteristics

Gender of Respondent

Previous research has shown that males are more likely to be involved in violence than females—both as perpetrators and as victims. Consequently, it was predicted that *Gender of Respondent* would influence the willingness of individuals to use force as a means for dealing with conflict. In contrast to this expected effect, while males in this study were always more likely than females to use physical force, *Gender of Respondent* was not statistically significant in any of the four Trials. *Gender of Respondent* was found to be significant in the analyses for Trial Two when *Robbery Scenario* was included in the model, but this was the only analysis where *Gender of Respondent* was significant.

In view of past research this finding is initially surprising and has significant implications for how we understand the effects of gender in relation to the use of violence. The general findings reflect past research in that male respondents said they would be more likely to use violence than female respondents. However, the findings also indicate that while gender is viewed as a stable person characteristic if defined in terms of biological sex, the effects of gender are not stable across social circumstances. Thus, the relationship between gender and violence cannot be adequately explained by theories that focus on biological sex or even by static gender roles.

In terms of predicting behaviour on the basis of gender, we can posit that males will be more likely to use violence than females; nevertheless, most males are not violent, and more importantly, even those who are violent do not use violence across all situations. In addition, females sometimes use violence. Past theoretical work in relation to gender and violence has not addressed these facts very well. In terms of predicting when and where violence will occur it is critical to go beyond gender and examine other important individual and situational factors that inform and trigger behavioural scripts that include the use of physical force as a means for dealing with conflict. While males are more likely than females to draw on scripts that include physical force, clearly there is a great deal more to understanding when and where such scripts will be invoked. The relationship between gender and violence must be understood in conjunction with other person characteristics and within the context of social situations. This is in fact what separates the current study from past research—it examines the relationship between gender and violence in exactly this manner.

Significantly, that *Gender of Respondent* does not have an independent effect on the willingness of respondents to use force directly reflects the fact that this study has moved beyond merely examining the assumed direct effects of gender. In contrast to a great deal of previous research, this study has investigated gender within the neglected context of social situations—in particular the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer*.[55] In actuality, given that this interaction term is included in the model it is *not* that surprising that *Gender of Respondent* does not have a consistent independent effect on the use of force. As stated, past research tells us that males are more likely to be involved in violence than females both as offenders, *and* as victims. Thus, the findings of this study can be seen to reflect the general *maleness* of violence. The results show that conflict is much more likely to result in the use of force when both parties are male. For example, if Trial One is rerun excluding the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer*, both of these variables have a statistically significant independent effect in the model. This means that the *Gender of Respondent* and the *Gender of Harm Doer* are important triggers for behavioural scripts that include the use of force as a means for dealing with conflict. However, it is the interaction between these two variables rather than their separate effects that account for the selection of scripts.

Past theory and research that has examined the effects of gender without examining gender-dynamic has neglected this relationship and has therefore not been able to explain the effects of gender in relation to violence very well. The current research highlights the critical fact that research findings in relation to gender and violence that fail to examine gender-dynamic may be misleading. Moreover, while the literature on gender and violence is correct in concluding that more research is needed in the area of female violence, the present study shows that female violence should not necessarily be examined in isolation from male violence. In other words, female violence does not need to be investigated as something that is completely different from male violence. To fully understand the relationship between gender and violence, both males and females should be included in the same research samples. The effective investigation of female violence, male violence, and/or their similarities and differences, requires the consideration of gender *and* gender-dynamic across different types of situations.

Age of Respondent

Not unlike gender, research has suggested that there is a relationship between age and violent behaviour. However, while there is evidence of maturational reform with regard to property crime, the age range is much wider for violent crime. At the same time, research suggests that younger people should be more likely to use physical force than older people (Markowitz and Felson 1998). Thus, it was predicted that *Age of Respondent* would have an independent effect on the use of physical force in that younger respondents would be more willing to use force than older respondents. In contrast to this prediction, *Age of Respondent* was not significant in any of the four Trials.

The fact that *Age of Respondent* was not found to be significant may suggest that this variable is simply not as important as other person and situation factors in relation to willingness to use force. For example, gender-dynamic and intensity of the situation appear to play a more significant role in the escalation of conflict into violence. The results of this study as a whole indicate that most people are not willing to use violence, but at the same time, there are situations where physical force is much more likely to occur. These findings intimate that this is true—regardless of age.

In addition, it is possible that the lack of statistical significance for *Age of Respondent* is related to the age characteristics of this sample. As noted in Chapter Three, the mean age for this sample is forty-two years. It is suspected that a sample including individuals under the age of eighteen, as well as a lower overall mean age, might produce different results—specifically, that differences by age would be more apparent. Notwithstanding the age distribution though, it is still important to recognize the general absence of the effects of *Age of Respondent* in relation to the willingness to use force. While past research suggests that younger people would be more willing to use physical force than older people, there was a distinct lack of support for this presumption in the current study.[56]

Low Self-control

The effects of low self-control were examined in relation to the use of physical force in the model with several other individual and situational characteristics. Based on past research it was predicted that individuals with low self-control would be more likely to use physical force as a means for dealing with conflict as compared to individuals who report a high level of self-control.

The analyses revealed that the effects of low self-control varied by Trial—low self-control was statistically significant in Trial One and Trial Four but not in Trial Two or Three. This variable remained statistically significant in the presence of domain and scenario effects. Still, the effects of low self-control are obviously not consistent. According to these findings, even individuals with low self-control are not always willing to use physical force as a means for dealing with conflict. The variation in the effects of low self-control across Trials raises questions about the stability of this variable in relation to the use of physical force.

Nevertheless, it is important to recall Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990: 89) argument that there are "situational conditions or other properties of the individual" that may counter self-control. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) go on to say that the effects of low self-control on involvement in crime and analogous acts are influenced by opportunity. They argue that when presented with an opportunity, individuals with low self-control will engage in these behaviours unless they are adequately constrained. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) do not expand on the opportunity side of their theory however.

In this study, all respondents are presented with the same types of situations or opportunities to use force. However, what constrains a person from using force in a given situation may vary. For example, male respondents who are faced with a female harm doer may be constrained from using force. Conversely, a male may be much less constrained when challenged by another male, possibly even viewing the situation as an opportunity to demonstrate masculinity. For another example, the Robbery Scenario is a situation that places very few constraints on the use of force, for female or male respondents, and even when the harm doer is female. Both of these examples illustrate the effects of *social* or *normative* constraints, however, other constraints may also be present. For example, a female may feel physically constrained when faced with a male harm doer.

In terms of gender differences in crime, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) say that males are always more involved in crime and analogous acts than females, and that gender differences in crime (and analogous acts) are a reflection of differences in self-control and opportunity. In this study, no interaction was found between gender and self-control. However, there do appear to be some gender differences in terms of both normative and physical constraints. Thus, it may be that various types of constraints act to filter the effects of self-control for males and females.

To summarize, in this study males and females have been presented with the same situations where they may or may not engage in the use of force as a means for dealing with conflict. In view of the fact that the effects of low self-control have been found to be inconsistent across Trials, it is suggested that in addition to self-control, and even opportunity, other factors are still important in explaining the use of force. These include properties of the individual such as *Attitudes Towards Violence*, and situational conditions associated with specific scenarios such as the Robbery Scenario. Such factors may constrain or *fail* to adequately constrain the use of force. Given the fact that this study has examined the effects of self-control in conjunction with other situational circumstances and individual characteristics, perhaps it is not that surprising to find inconsistencies in the effects of *Low Self-control*.

Nevertheless, these findings suggest the need for more comprehensive research with regard to the effects of *Low Self-control*. There is a significant need to delve further into the investigation of Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990: 89) argument that there are "situational conditions or other properties of the individual" that may counter (or constrain) self-control (see also Nakhaie et al. 2000). While someone with low self-control is probably more likely than someone with high self-control to interpret certain types of situations as opportunities to satisfy their own needs quickly and easily, future research needs to look at how opportunity relates to situational constraints. Moreover, what constitutes a situational constraint may vary by subgroups of individuals—such as by gender or age.

In discussing the effects of self-control it is important to note a potential methodological limitation associated with the measurement of this variable as well. Given the fact that this research is based on the use of hypothetical scenarios, while we can acquire a comprehensive understanding of how individuals think they will behave in certain situations, this may not always translate into actual behaviour. In other words, respondents with low self-control may say that they would not be willing to use physical force in a hypothetical survey situation, however, it is possible that in an actual conflict situation the effects of low self-control might be more evident.

Overall, this study shows that the effects of self-control are not stable across Trials. It is probable that individuals with low self-control are more likely to learn routines that include violence as an easier and more immediately gratifying means for dealing with conflict. Nevertheless, this research clearly demonstrates that having low self-control is not enough to determine whether or not an individual will be willing to use force in a given situation. We must also consider potential constraints in the form of "situational conditions or other properties of the individual" (Gottfredson and Hirschi: 1990:89).

Attitudes Towards Violence

Attitudes towards violence constitute the content of behavioural scripts that may include the use of violence as a means for dealing with conflict. In other words, attitudes can be seen as a cognitive directive for behaviour. It was hypothesized that respondents with positive attitudes towards violence would be more likely to engage in violent behaviour, as compared to respondents who did not have positive attitudes towards violence.

The analyses revealed that *Attitudes Towards Violence* was statistically significant in Trial One and Trial Two only. These effects remained when domain and scenario effects were added to the models. Interpreting the variation in the effects of attitudes across Trials is difficult (i.e., the fact that this variable is not significant in Trial Three or Trial Four). Not unlike the other person characteristics examined in this study, *Attitudes Towards Violence* do not vary across Trials, so why do their effects? One possible explanation of this variation is that it may in part be related to the manner in which this variable has been operationalized in the current study.

Recall that the scale for *Attitudes Towards Violence* was created in reference to situations involving adult strangers. Thus, the scenarios presented to respondents did not include situations that occurred within the Domestic Domain (Trial Three), for example. If this scale were based on a more diverse set of situations, perhaps it would be more indicative of *Attitudes Towards Violence* in general and perhaps then the results would be different. Future studies that examine the relationship between attitudes and behaviour must ensure that the measures for *Attitudes Towards Violence* reflect the diversity of situations within which violence occurs.

With regard to the operationalization of this variable, it is also important to point out that the situations used to create the scale for *Attitudes Towards Violence* do not involve females—either as perpetrators or as victims. This is a noteworthy limitation because while some individuals might tolerate violence involving male strangers in certain circumstances, they may not be as tolerant of the use of force involving females. In addition, the fact that a female respondent may tolerate violence between two male strangers does not necessarily imply that this would increase the likelihood of engaging in the use of force herself.

This measurement observation is important because the fact that *Attitudes Towards Violence* vary by gender is of particular interest and relevance to this study. As discussed in the Chapter Two, males are more likely to hold positive attitudes towards violence than are females.[57] Moreover, research has found that gender differences in *Attitudes Towards Violence* help explain gender differences in behaviour. Not only are males more likely to have positive attitudes towards violence, they are also more likely to engage in violent behaviour. Thus, there is an important relationship between *Attitudes Towards Violence* and the use of violence (Vernberg et al. 1999; Markowitz and Felson 1998). In addition, *Attitudes Towards Violence* have been found to vary in accordance with the gender of the target and the gender-dynamic of situations (Koski and Mangold 1988; Felson 2000). All of this means that limitations associated with the operationalization of *Attitudes Towards Violence* in this study must be taken into account when interpreting the relationship between attitudes and scripts that include violence as a means for dealing with conflict.

Keeping these measurement issues in mind, the research findings still suggest that attitudes are an important factor in behavioural scripts, along with other person and situation factors. Attitudes towards violence influence the way individuals interpret social cues in that they represent the cognitive element of scripts or routines for dealing with conflict. In general, those who have positive attitudes towards violence will be more likely to engage in violent behaviour than those who do not have such attitudes. Importantly though, this research indicates that the translation of attitudes into action will be related to situational factors.

Fear of Crime

Fear of crime was not significant in any of the four Trials. This finding may be related to one or more of three factors. First, it is important to recall that the level of reported *Fear of Crime* was not high in this study. If the range of this variable were greater, the results might be different. Second, the results could reflect the fact that the analyses in this study are based on hypothetical scenarios. It is plausible that in certain types of conflict situations an individual who is very fearful will experience more anxiety than someone who is less fearful, and that this anxiety may disrupt their cognitive interpretation of those situations. Finally, it may be the case that *Fear of Crime* is more relevant to situation selection rather that behaviour in situations. Unfortunately, the relationship between *Fear of Crime* and situation selection could not be accounted for in this study. Overall, while fear of crime was not found to be statistically significant, it is possible that if this variable could be adequately measured in actual situations it would be found to influence how individuals respond to conflict of certain kinds. Admittedly though, this type of research would face both empirical and ethical challenges.

Past Victimization

The principles of routine conflict theory suggest that past experiences—such as victimization experiences—contribute to the development, maintenance and alteration of behavioural scripts for future behaviour. However, as stated earlier, it is difficult to predict the ways in which victimization will shape these scripts. Whether or not past victimization experiences increase or decrease the likelihood of using force in future situations will likely be related to whether or not force was used in past situations, as well as how successful the use of force was in dealing with conflict. In any case, past victimization experiences were not found to be statistically significant in any of the four Trials.

This finding is somewhat surprising, so initially, the fact that type of victimization would be relevant was considered. To explore this possibility, subsequent analyses were conducted for those individuals who reported having been a victim of assault to see if this particular type of victimization would increase or decrease the likelihood of the use of force in future situations. As with victimization in general though, the results revealed that this type of victimization did not influence the use of force in any of the four Trials.

This finding was not anticipated. While the proposed reasons for this outcome are speculative, measurement issues may be part of the reason for this insignificant finding. First, not unlike the potentially disruptive effects of fear in actual situations, past victimization experiences may also promote greater anxiety in future situations—something that cannot be experienced in a hypothetical context. Second, in terms of the prediction that past victimization may alter routines for dealing with conflict, sample characteristics are likely a factor. This study is based on a general population sample that reports a low level of violent victimization. If the relationship between past violent victimization and future use of violence could be examined for individuals who have had a greater number of relevant experiences, the relationship between these experiences and their behavioural scripts might be more evident. This kind of a sample would facilitate a more detailed investigation of the processes relating to the development of behavioural scripts that may *or may not* include the use of violence as a means for dealing with conflict. Third, the present study did not measure the frequency of past victimization experiences. This is an important limitation because, in all likelihood, being physically assaulted on one occasion will not change an individual's routine for dealing with conflict; however, repeat victimization could influence routines. This factor cannot be accounted for in this study. Finally, as was the case with *Fear of Crime*, *Past Victimization* may be related to situation selection. Again, however, this relationship could not be tested.

Summary of Person Factors

In terms of routines for dealing with conflict, thus far we can predict that young males who have low self-control and positive attitudes towards violence will be more likely to use physical force than other individuals. Nevertheless, of the person factors included in this model, none were consistent in their effects across Trials, and two factors (*Fear of Crime* and *Past Victimization*) had no effect at all. Given the fact that this study is cross-sectional in design and therefore person characteristics of respondents are the same for each of the four Trials (for example, attitudes do not change), variation in the effects of these variables across situations is a very significant finding. In particular, variation in the effects of *Gender of Respondent*, *Age of Respondent*, *Low Self-control* and *Attitudes Towards Violence* point to the importance of situational factors in shaping the outcome of conflict. In contrast to the assumptions of much previous research, these factors cannot be viewed as static in their effects. Significantly then, the use of physical force as a means for dealing with conflict cannot be accurately predicted on the basis of person characteristics alone—the situation must be considered as well.

Situational Factors

Upset

It can be argued that level of upset is not a pure situational factor in that there will be variation in level of upset by person characteristics. Nevertheless, based on the general assumption that situation will be more consistent in its effects on *Upset* than person characteristics, *Upset* is treated as a situational factor. It is assumed that *all* respondents should be more upset in situations that are highly intense than in situations that are of low intensity, while person characteristics such as age and gender will to varying extents augment this general trend. Thus, *Upset* is seen as more situation than person oriented and is conceptualized in this manner.

The variable *Upset* was statistically significant in each of the four Trials. In addition, this variable remains statistically significant when domain and scenario effects are included in the models. In terms of routine conflict, this study indicates that the more upset a person becomes the more likely it is that they will use physical force. Thus, *Upset* is a relatively consistent factor in relation to the use of force. Moreover, the results indicate that this is true for both males and females. This is a factor that does not vary by gender. Significantly, similarities between males and females such as this will not be exposed unless, as in this study, males and females are examined together in the same sample and in the same types of situations.

Intensity

The results of this study reveal that *Intensity* is statistically significant in Trial's One, Two and Three but not in Trial Four. In addition, with the exception of Trial Four, *Intensity* remains significant in the presence of domain and scenario effects. The fact that intensity is not statistically significant in Trial Four is unexpected and difficult to explain. One possible reason for this finding though, is that within the Leisure Domain their may be fewer normative constraints on the use of force and therefore *Intensity* may be less influential. In fact, social norms within the Leisure Domain may even promote the use of force. To illustrate, heated verbal exchanges that take place in a bar atmosphere or at a sporting event may be more likely to escalate into a physical dispute than if the same exchanges were to occur at the respondent's place of employment. The Work Domain will likely have added professional constraints on behaviour, whereas the Leisure

Domain may be characterized by social norms that not only fail to constrain violence, but encourage such a response. Overall, the results suggest that most times highly intense conflict situations will be more likely to invoke behavioural scripts that include the use of physical force than low intensity situations.

Gender of Harm Doer

It was predicted that male harm doers would be the more likely targets of physical force than female harm doers—in other words, that male targets would trigger a different routine response than female targets in situations of conflict. However, *Gender of Harm Doer* was statistically significant only in Trial Two. In addition, while this variable remains statistically significant when *Street Domain* is added to the analysis, *Gender of Harm Doer* is no longer significant when *Robbery Scenario* is added to the model. Initially this finding is surprising; however, as was the case with the lack of significance associated with *Gender of Respondent*, it is not the case that *Gender of Harm Doer* is not substantively related to the use of force. Instead, the effects of this variable are consumed by the interaction between *Gender of Harm Doer* and *Gender of Respondent*. This interaction will be discussed in more detail shortly.

Age of Harm Doer

It was predicted that respondents would be less likely to use physical force against an older harm doer as opposed to a younger harm doer. In contrast to this prediction, *Age of Harm Doer* was found to be statistically significant in Trial One and Trial Two only. This variable remained significant in the presence of domain and scenario effects for Trial One but not for Trial Two. With regard to routine conflict, it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions about this situational factor on the basis of these analyses.

One explanation for this mixed finding, however, is that the effects of *Age of Harm Doer* may be due to chance. Another possibility is that *Age of Harm Doer* is simply less important in some conflict settings than variables such as *Gender of Respondent, Gender of Harm Doer* or *Intensity*. In addition, not unlike some of the other variables included in the model, *Age of Harm Doer* may be a variable that is difficult to measure through the use of hypothetical scenarios. When faced with an actual target, in an actual conflict situation, respondents may be less likely to use force against an elderly target because they may feel it is less necessary. In contrast, some individuals might interpret the behaviour of a younger person as more offensive and more intense, and that too could alter the course of the conflict. As indicated in the discussion relating to *Age of Respondent*, more research is needed to further explore the relationship between age and violent behaviour in general.

Respondent Alone

Based on previous analyses of the conflict data set by Kennedy and Forde (1999), it was predicted that *Respondent Alone* would have no independent effects in the model. In contrast to this prediction this variable was statistically significant in Trial Four. In addition, this variable remains significant when domain and scenario effects are added to the model—in fact, the effects become stronger. Overall, in this Trial, when respondents are *not* alone they are more likely to say that they would be willing to use physical force than if they were alone.[58]

It is not completely clear why *Respondent Alone* is significant in this Trial. As was the case with *Age of Harm Doer*, this finding may be due to chance. However, given that the effects become stronger when *Leisure Domain* and *Sport Scenario* are added, it may also be the case that there are certain types of situations where being alone—or not being alone—is a more significant factor in the decision-making process surrounding the use of force. This may be the case for the *Leisure Domain* and the scenarios representing this domain, as compared to the *Work Domain* for example. From a normative standpoint, it may be that when individuals are challenged in a particular social setting (e.g., *Sport Event Scenario*) they are more likely to use physical force in the presence of others as a means of 'impression management'. It is argued here that essentially, bystanders can be viewed as enforcers of social norms—whether those norms inhibit or encourage the use of force. For example, if the conflict occurs at a sporting event, the use of force may be more likely than if the conflict occurs in a place of employment, due to less social constraints on the use of force in leisure settings. Bystanders at a sporting event may even encourage the use of force, while bystanders at a place of employment may ensure that social norms are not breached and therefore that the conflict does not escalate to the point of violence. The effects of *Respondent Alone* may further vary by gender-dynamic. An interaction term was created to examine this possibility and will be discussed shortly.

Summary of Situational Factors

In summary, of the situational factors examined in this study, *Upset* and *Intensity* are the most consistent in their effects. On the other hand, the variables *Gender of Harm Doer*, *Age of Harm Doer*, and *Respondent Alone* are not consistent as social cues in the use of force. With regard to routines for dealing with conflict then, we can predict that the use of force is most likely in situations where there is a greater level of upset and where the level of intensity is high. Situations with these characteristics are the most likely to trigger a behavioural script that includes the use of physical force by the respondent. This does not tell us a great deal however. As was the case with the person factors, the majority of the situational factors are not consistent in their effects on the use of force. Consequently, it has been shown once again that in order to increase the ability to predict the use of force it is necessary to include both person and situation factors in the same model—as well as their interactions.

Interaction Terms

*Gender * Gender * Alone*

It was predicted that there would be an interaction effect between the gender-dynamic of an encounter and *Respondent Alone* with regard to whether or not the respondent would use physical force as a means for dealing with conflict. Research suggests that the effects of the presence of bystanders will vary in accordance with the gender-dynamic of the encounter (Felson 2000). More specifically, the routine should be that in the presence of bystanders, same-gender encounters are more likely to escalate to violence than opposite-gender encounters (Felson 2000). Notwithstanding past research findings, this interaction term was not significant in any of the four Trials (see Appendix I).[59]

While the analyses revealed that the differences in the effects of bystanders in relation to gender-dynamic are too small to draw any solid conclusions, the general trend is that same-gender incidents are more likely to involve the use of physical force when bystanders are present as was hypothesized. In contrast, the hypothesis that opposite gender-encounters would be less likely to involve the use of force in the presence of bystanders was not consistently supported.

A study conducted by Felson (2000) did find a significant interaction between bystanders and gender-dynamic; however, violence was not the dependent variable in that study. Instead, Felson (2000) examined the likelihood of witnesses calling the police rather than the use of force itself. Nevertheless, the findings are still important with regard to the interaction between gender-dynamic and bystanders in terms of social norms and their influence on bystander behaviour.

One explanation for this discrepancy may be that the effects of the interaction between gender-dynamic and bystanders on the use of force are related to other factors such as domain and relationship. Indeed, Felson (2000) found that relational distance and whether or not the incident occurs in public or in private effects first, whether or not witnesses are present, and second, whether or not the witnesses report the incident to the police. Consequently, this already complex interaction is likely even more complex in that the effects may be further dependent on how private or public the social setting is and the relationship between the parties (see also Felson and Messner 1998). Unfortunately, the current study does not include scenarios where the respondent is involved in conflict with an intimate (in a private or public setting) that would allow for this comparison. Future studies on gender and violence must examine all of these factors together in the same model.

Gender * Gender

The interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* is the most significant and consistent finding in this study. It was predicted that male respondents would be more likely to use force overall, and that they would be much less likely to use force against a female harm doer as opposed to a male harm doer. This interaction term was statistically significant in every Trial. In addition, this interaction term remains significant when domain and scenario effects are added to the analyses for all four Trials.

The primary implication of this finding is that the effects of gender-dynamic on the likelihood of violence in conflict situations cannot be ignored. This finding indicates that to understand the effects of gender in relation to violence, it is not enough to examine the gender of the offender or the gender of target separately, instead, this interaction term must be included. The relationship between gender and violence cannot be described simply in terms of the greater likelihood of males to use force than females, or by the fact that males are more likely to be the targets of force—both components are necessary.

With regard to the interpretation of these findings, subsequent analyses revealed that the tendency is for male respondents *not* to use physical force against female harm doers and for female respondents to make few, if any distinctions based on *Gender of Harm Doer*. Overall then, this interaction effect is driven by the fact that male respondents are much less likely to use physical force against a female harm doer as compared to a male harm doer.

An exception to this general trend is that in Trial Two female respondents are less likely to use physical force against a male harm doer, while male respondents do not make any real distinction between male and female harm doers. Perhaps in Trial Two the perceived intensity of the Street Domain scenarios is greater than situations in other domains and this increases the overall likelihood of the use of force; however, there is still variation by *Gender of Respondent*.

For male respondents the high level of intensity in Trial Two is more likely to trigger a behavioural script that includes the use of physical force regardless of *Gender of Harm Doer*. In other words, for males, *Intensity* can overpower prevalent gendered norms for behaviour that may be operating in the other Trials. There is also evidence to suggest that "inhibitions about attacking females may be lower if females attack first" (Felson 2000: 96). Similarly, notwithstanding the fact that there are strong normative barriers to female violence, female respondents may be more likely to feel that the use of physical force is justified in highly intense situations—these situations come with fewer social constraints. At the same time however, females may feel physically unable to combat a male harm doer. This explanation would account for the increased likelihood of females to use physical force in this Trial as compared to other Trials, as well as their greater likelihood of using force against a female as compared to a male.

In terms of routines for dealing with conflict, for male respondents the strongest prediction that can be made based on these findings is that they will be less likely to use physical force against a female target as compared to a male target. However, when conflict situations are very intense, the situation can become more powerful than gendered behavioural norms. Thus, in some situations male respondents are able to justify the use of physical force against a female target. On the other hand, for female respondents the strongest prediction that can be made is that their decision to engage in the use of force will be more dependent on person and situational factors other than *Gender of Harm Doer*. For females, *Gender of Harm Doer* was only important in Trial Two—the Trial with the greatest use of physical force. In this case, it may be that the combination of intensity and a male harm doer makes the use of force too risky.[60]

Overall, gender-dynamic is an important situational factor. For males, the effects of *Gender of Harm Doer* may be best explained by Felson's (2000) notion that the use of force by males towards females is antinormative behaviour, as well as the fact that force should be less necessary against a female as compared to a male harm doer. Luckenbill's (1977) concept of the "character contest" may also apply here. For female respondents on the other hand, while the use of physical force in conflict situations may also be shaped by social norms—these norms say that they should not use physical force at all. In addition, females generally face a greater physical threat.

It is interesting to note that while the use of force by a male against a female is often considered deviant, the same does not appear to be consistently true for the use of force by a female against a male or violence that occurs between two males. Hence, while powerful social norms constrain the use of force by males against females, as well as the use of force by females more generally, it seems that social norms are not as constraining in other types of situations. In fact, the violence literature indicates that situations in which a female uses force against a male, or where the violence occurs between two males are commonly trivialized. Of course, this too will vary by more specific situational factors.

In sum, reflecting on this discussion of the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer*, it becomes very clear that gender-dynamic is a critical factor in the escalation of routine conflict into violence. As found in the general violence literature and as predicted in this study, situations involving two males are routinely more likely to escalate to violence, as compared to situations with other gender-dynamics. Moreover, it has been suggested herein that the primary explanation of this finding is normative in nature—strong social norms govern the use of force by males against females and by females more generally. Relatedly, gendered social norms may actually *encourage* the use of force by males against males in some social settings (Luckenbill 1977). It has also been shown however, that gender norms are sometimes overwhelmed by situational factors (e.g., in the Robbery Scenario). Regardless, the primary implication of this finding is that if social norms inhibit the use of force by males against females, then reconstructing social norms in relation to male-male violence should be a key factor in preventing much of this behaviour.

Age of Respondent * Upset

An interaction effect between *Age of Respondent* and *Upset* was predicted. Specifically, it was expected that of respondents who reported being upset, older respondents would be less likely to use force than younger respondents. However, this interaction term was statistically significant in Trial One and Trial Four only.

These results are difficult to interpret and no cohesive predictions about this interaction with regard to routine conflict should be made based on these findings. While the research suggests that level of upset is a relatively consistent predictor in the use of force, effects associated with *Age of Respondent* were not clear and this is likely reflected in this interaction term as well. As previously discussed, these results may in part be related to the age characteristics of this particular sample. A lower mean age and the inclusion of individuals under the age of eighteen might alter the results. What can be gleaned from these findings though, is that in terms of the relationship between age and the use of force it is not enough to say that younger people will always be more likely to use physical force than older people. For respondents of all ages, the decision to use force is influenced by other person characteristics and the nature of specific situations.

Summary of Interaction Terms

Emphasis in this study has been placed on the assumption that there are interactions among person and situation factors in routines for dealing with conflict. In contrast to the many predictions that were made based on the theoretical literature and past research, of the primary interactions examined in this study, only *Gender of Respondent * Gender of Harm Doer* and *Age of Respondent * Upset* were found to be statistically significant.[61] Importantly though, *Gender of Respondent * Gender of Harm Doer* was statistically significant in every Trial and remained consistent in its effects in the presence of domain and scenario effects. Based on these results, the following predictions can be made in relation to routine conflict. First, situations involving two males are the most likely to involve the use of force. Second, in most cases males will be much less likely to use physical force against female harm doers as compared to male harm doers. And Third, *Gender of Harm Doer* is not as significant for females as it is for males with regard to the decision of whether or not to use physical force as a means for dealing with conflict.

Notwithstanding the overall lack of empirical support for the interaction terms included in these analyses, the current research should by no means be taken as a negation of the likelihood that other important interaction effects associated with the use of force exist. Given the fact that violent situations are inherently dynamic, it is likely that other person and situation factors not examined here, along with their interactions, are related to the use of force in conflict situations. For example, some research points to the existence of an interaction between gender-dynamic and relationship (Felson 2000). For another example, the presence of a weapon could interact with gender effects in that a weapon can neutralize physical differences between males and females. Alcohol consumption is yet another factor that could interact with the effects of person factors such as gender, age, attitudes and self-control and ultimately influence the perception of situational factors (Dent and Arias 1990). Alcohol can also serve to neutralize normative inhibitions that may otherwise be associated with person or situation factors such as gender or domain. Unfortunately, the effects of relationship, weapons and alcohol could not be examined in this study. Future research should examine these factors and their potential interaction effects in relation to the use of force in conflict situations.

Domain and Scenario

In view of the initial results presented in Chapter Four, it became clear that it was necessary to explore the findings in more detail within the context of domain and scenario. These analyses revealed that the effects of social domain and scenario are significant. This means that in addition to the person and situation factors examined across the four Trials, the social domain within which these interactions occur has a significant effect on the willingness to use physical force. Moreover, when social domain is broken down further into unique scenarios, the characteristics of the particular scenarios are important—either in increasing or decreasing willingness to use force. These findings reveal the critical value of extending analyses of violence beyond person characteristics and even common situational factors. Instead, it is necessary to look at both person and situation factors within the specific circumstances of conflict oriented social interactions.

This of course raises the issue of *how* specific the examination of circumstances needs to be to adequately explain violence. If the goal is to predict the situations within which violence is most likely to occur, some level of generalizability is desired. The challenge is to find a balance. On the basis of the current research and taking into account past research, it is suggested here that further and improved empirical testing of integrated models of violence will ultimately reveal a core set of predictor variables. It is believed that these will include self-control, attitudes towards violence, gender-dynamic, relationship, social domain (albeit using stronger indicators than in the present study), the presence of bystanders, alcohol consumption and sometimes weapons, to name a few (Jurik and Winn 1990). While there will always be a certain level of error associated with the predicted likelihood of violence, research has demonstrated that there are some factors that are frequently associated with this outcome. The task of future research will be to determine how exactly these factors work together to increase the likelihood of a violent outcome. Suggestions for how this can be achieved will be made later in this chapter.

Summary of Themes

These analyses have examined the effects of person characteristics, situational factors and interactions among these variables with regard to their role in routines for dealing with conflict. First, in terms of routine conflict, person characteristics have been found to be inconsistent in their effects across Trials. Second, of the situational factors included in this study, only two were relatively consistent in their effects—*Upset* and *Intensity*. Third, of the interaction terms examined, the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* is the only interaction term that is consistent in its effects. In fact, along with *Upset*, gender-dynamic is the most consistent variable in the analyses. This finding is consequential because it speaks to the importance of situational dynamics in the use of force over person and situation characteristics alone. More specifically, while *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* are often viewed as immutable person characteristics as measured by biological sex, their effects within situations of conflict are clearly mutable. The reason for this is that the effects of *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* vary with each other, as well as with other person and situation factors. Finally, domain and scenario characteristics have a significant impact on whether or not respondents say they would be willing to use physical force as a means for dealing with conflict. Past research has not addressed the social dynamics of violence very well—especially in relation to gender-dynamic.

In terms of routines for dealing with conflict this study indicates that behavioural scripts that include the use of physical force are most likely to be drawn upon by young males who have low self-control and positive attitudes towards violence. The situational cues most likely to trigger this kind of a script include a greater level of upset and a high level of intensity. In addition, there is a strong interactive effect between *Gender of Respondent* and the *Gender of Harm Doer*—for male respondents, a male harm doer triggers a different script or routine response than does a female harm doer under most circumstances. And again, routines for dealing with conflict depend on the social domain, and in particular, the unique characteristics of conflict scenarios. Specifically, this study found that respondents report that they would be most likely to use physical force as a means for dealing with conflict in the Street Domain, and even more specifically, in the Robbery Scenario.

Implications of the Findings

In this study it has been argued that knowing who offenders are does not tell us when, where and under what circumstances violence is most likely to occur. At the same time, we cannot predict violence solely on the basis of situation. If we could predict violence on the basis of individual or situational factors alone, there would be greater consistency in the use of violence by particular individuals and across similar types of situations. Instead, it has been argued that both person and situation are important for understanding the processes associated with violence. The results of this study clearly support this argument.

Routine conflict theory suggests that individuals enter into social situations with expectations about how those interactions will proceed. The implication is that people behave in routine and predictable ways and that this applies to the use of physical force in situations of conflict as well. In other words, sometimes the use of force is normative. It has been argued that routine conflict is more likely to include the use of force when a young male with low self-control and positive attitudes towards violence is faced with a male target, is very upset and the situation is intense. Consequently, there do appear to be some routine characteristics associated with the use of physical force. Moreover, these findings show that both person and situational factors are critical to understanding the use of force. So what implications do these findings have for the way we understand violence in our society, and in particular, the relationship between gender and violence?

First, in terms of person characteristics, this study has shown that having low self-control is sometimes a factor associated with the use of physical force in routine conflict management strategies, but that the effects of this variable vary across person and situation combinations. Another finding has been that attitudes towards violence are an important cognitive factor in the use of violence. While there is variation by situation, this research shows that having positive attitudes towards violence generally increases the likelihood that violence will be considered as a means for dealing with conflict. The implication is that the modification of social norms associated with the use of violence can influence the actual use of violence.

Next, with regard to situational factors, it is not surprising that when situations are more intense and when people are more upset, force is more likely to be used than in less intense situations and/or when people are not upset. However, the fact that the gender of the target (and presumably other situational factors) can alter routines for dealing with conflict is critical. That males are much less likely to use physical force against a female as compared to a male is an indication of the influence of social norms on routines for dealing with conflict. Importantly, the gender of the target should be seen as only one of several social cues or triggers for scripts that include the use of force. For example, the presence of bystanders may increase or decrease the likelihood of force—depending on the situation. While we cannot always prevent the occurrence of intense conflict situations, we can work to change social norms that inform routines for *dealing with* intense conflict. In particular, non-violent methods for dealing with conflict should be strongly advocated.

In relation to gender differences in violence it has been argued throughout this thesis that the tendency of past research has been to attribute gender differences in violent behaviour to the sex differences of offenders, and later on to gender role differences. However, this study has revealed variation in the effects of gender across Trials when situation factors are added to the model. The primary implication of this is that explanations of the relationship between gender and violence rooted in assumptions about immutable sex differences or even static gender roles are inadequate. These explanations cannot account for variation at the level of situation. Relatedly, a sex-based explanation cannot account for the fact that gender-dynamic appears to be more consequential than the gender of the individuals involved as measured separately.

In fact, this research suggests that it is more pertinent to operationalize gender as a situational factor—as one factor in the normative management of situated conduct—rather than as a static person characteristic. Gender should ultimately be viewed as a situational factor in the sense that the effects of gender vary by circumstance—social norms that inform the gendered nature of behaviour are situation dependent. For example, while females are less likely to use violence, there are situations where females will engage in this behaviour—perhaps when they are intoxicated, very angry or where they feel it is necessary for self-defense. While violence by males against females may be viewed as antinormative, there are still cases where males will use violence against females—for example if the female attacks the male first (Felson 2000). It is clear from the findings in this study that gender does not *determine* behaviour—instead its effects vary in accordance with other person and situation factors. Thus, while there is a distinct and persistent gender-gap in violent behaviour, rather than focusing on sex differences we should be asking more questions about what routines are considered normative for males and females in particular social situations.

Moreover, the consistent strength of the interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer* is indicative of the value of examining the dynamics associated with situations of conflict as opposed to person or situation factors alone. Although the majority of the interaction terms examined in this study were not found to be significant, this should not lead to an abandonment of the search for other interactions. As previously noted, potential interactions between gender, relationship, social domain and the effects of alcohol or weapons should be explored in much greater detail. More of this kind of research is necessary in order to sort out the dynamics of these relationships.

Altogether, this study suggests that it is most appropriate to study violence as a dynamic transaction—as a phenomenon that involves relationships between person and situational factors. This applies to gender as well. Again, persistent gender differences in the use of violence cannot be explained solely in terms of biological *sex* differences. In contrast, the social constructionist ideas that inform routine conflict theory allow for variation in the effects of gender across different types of situations. As a result, the routine conflict approach enables the reconciliation of findings that include both similarities and differences in the use of force by male and female respondents across situations—notwithstanding their basic *sex differences*.

While it has been acknowledged that past research has neglected gender through the exclusion of females from research samples, in addition to including both males and females in samples, it is also necessary to examine other person characteristics and situational factors. Person characteristics must be explored so that within-gender variation in scripts for behaviour can be understood. In addition, this study has revealed the importance of situational factors—in particular the gender of the target—in routines that include the use of force by respondents (especially male respondents).

In summary, people do behave in routine and predictable ways. At the same time however, it is very clear that we have not yet learned enough about the development of such routines or the situational factors that trigger routines in conflict situations to accurately predict when and where violence will occur. Nevertheless, more information about critical person and situation factors related to the use of violence, as well as an improved comprehension of how these factors interact, will result in an enhanced predictive model of violent behaviour.

Contributions of the Current Research

This research has contributed to the study of violence in a number of important ways. First, this study has revealed interesting findings in relation to the effects of person characteristics on violence as a potential outcome in conflict situations. This study has shown that while variables such as *Low Self-control* and *Attitudes Towards Violence* influence routines for dealing with conflict, these variables are not consistent in their effects across Trials.

This leads to the second primary contribution of this research, which is that it has drawn attention to the importance of situational factors as social triggers or cues that channel and constrain individual propensity for the use of physical force in conflict situations. For example, it has been demonstrated that even individuals with low self-control do not use force in every type of situation.

Third, through the adoption of an interactionist position, this research has investigated the combined and interaction effects between individual and situational level variables in relation to violence. For example, this study has revealed the importance of individual characteristics such as *Attitudes Towards Violence* in conjunction with

Intensity: In addition, this research has demonstrated that gender-dynamic is a more powerful predictor of the use of force than the gender of the perpetrator or the gender of the target alone. Consequently, this study has illustrated the complexity of the effects of person characteristics, situational variables and gender in relation to the violence.

Fourth, this study examines all of the above factors associated with violence (person factors, situation factors, interactions and gender), in conjunction with domain and scenario effects. For example, the power of gender-dynamic in the presence of different types of social domains and scenarios has been clearly illustrated. As discussed in this thesis, current research has been moving more towards the direction of integrated models that include both person and situation factors, as well as their interactions. Nevertheless, this researcher could not find any other studies of violence that bring together person factors, situational factors and the interaction between person and situation factors in the same model, and that examine these combinations across four separate domains and multiple scenarios.

Finally, this study makes a valuable contribution to the literature because it has examined the willingness of everyday people—both males and females—to use physical force in a variety of domains and scenarios. The use of hypothetical scenarios has permitted a unique opportunity to compare and contrast males and females from the general population in the same types of situations. In particular, this study has provided the opportunity to observe females in hypothetical situations that occur outside of the domestic domain. This methodology distinguishes the present research from studies that have relied upon offender samples and/or official crime statistics. In fact, while other studies have investigated gender differences at the macro statistical level or in terms of individual personality traits, few have examined the effects of gender at the level of situation. Methodological and data limitations are likely one of the primary reasons for this inattention.

Overall, this study has demonstrated that violence is normative for certain people in certain types of situations. The empirical consequence of this is that all violence cannot simply be explained away as reactive and impulsive and without reason. Even violence that appears to be impulsive can be seen as a reflection of previously learned routines for dealing with conflict.

Study Limitations

There are several important limitations associated with this study that must be recognized. First of all, some researchers will view the use of hypothetical scenarios as a limitation. It is clear that scenarios cannot capture certain factors related to the context of violence such as the effects of alcohol or drugs, or emotional states such as anger. What people think they would do in a situation might differ from what they would actually do if they were intoxicated or very angry for example.

At the same time however, as explained in Chapter Three, hypothetical scenarios have distinct methodological advantages. In this study the use of scenarios has enabled an ethical "experimental" approach to the study of violence and has thus facilitated the exploration of questions that would otherwise be difficult if not impossible to answer. The use of scenarios has permitted the investigation of what people think they would do if they were faced with certain types of situations. From this, it can be inferred that individuals do make distinctions with regard to when, where and against whom violence is tolerable.

The use of hypothetical scenarios has further facilitated the use of a random sample of everyday people, including an equal distribution of males and females, and the ability to place these individuals in comparable and controlled situations. While beliefs about behaviour may not always translate into actual behaviour, the very fact that males and females consider the use of violence in certain circumstances but not others cannot be overlooked. The use of violence must be examined within a normative framework and cannot always be explained away by factors such as alcohol, anger or fear. Even those individuals who are angry and drunk do not always resort to violence as a means for dealing with conflict. Having cited these obvious advantages of using hypothetical scenarios though, the limitation of failing to account for certain factors commonly associated with the willingness to use force in the present study is still significant (e.g., the effects of alcohol or emotional states).

Perhaps the real limitation here though is not so much the use of hypothetical scenarios themselves, but rather the nature of the scenarios used in this particular study. While the scenarios developed for the original Conflict Study measure several variables quite well, the research questions posed by the current study could be better addressed through the use of different scenarios. For example, while it is clearly an advantage to be able to explore what both males and females feel they will do in situations involving strangers, none of the scenarios place respondents in situations of conflict with intimates. Moreover, the majority of the situations occur in more public settings. It would be of extreme value to explore gender differences in the willingness to use force against strangers versus intimates, and within private versus public settings. Specific examples of scenarios that could be used to address the needs of the current study, as well as other studies where the objective is to examine gender, violence and situation, will be presented in conjunction with the suggestions for future research.

Second, given the significance of attitudes to the content of behavioural scripts, as previously indicated, the fact that the measure of attitudes towards violence used in this study cannot adequately test for the potential *gendered* nature of attitudes is a critical limitation. If this measure of attitudes had taken into account attitudes towards female-female violence or male-female violence, the relationship between attitudes and behavioural scripts could have been much more thoroughly examined.

Third, since this research is cross-sectional and there are no measures that can be used to explore the development of behavioural scripts, it cannot comment on how scripts develop or whether they change over time. For example, respondents were not questioned about routines for dealing with conflict that they may have been exposed to in their household of origin (i.e., during their childhood and adolescence). Moreover, it cannot be determined from these data if the respondents' routines for dealing with conflict are different now than in the past.

Fourth, in reference to the central argument of this study that individuals develop routines for dealing with conflict that are triggered by situational cues, the fact that these data do not permit the examination of individuals' behaviour in similar situations over time is a shortcoming. If patterns could be examined over time, an argument for the existence of 'routines' could be much more strongly established.

Finally, in terms of methodology, given the fact that the interviewer is speaking directly to subjects via the telephone, there is the concern that respondents will convey only what they believe to be socially acceptable responses. The obvious consequence of this is that a respondent may tell the interviewer that they do not approve of violence under any circumstances or that they would not be willing to use force under any circumstances when in fact this is not the case. Thus, as with any social science research that deals with a sensitive topic, the validity of the responses must be viewed with a critical eye.

Suggestions for Future Research

Taking into consideration the findings of this research as well as the limitations associated with this study, several suggestions for future research can be made. First and foremost, there is a definite need to learn more about the development of behavioural scripts that include violence as a means for dealing with conflict—as well as scripts that do not include violence. The development of these scripts in relation to person characteristics such as gender, attitudes towards violence, past experiences with victimization and past exposure to violent routines must be further explored.

With regard to the examination of attitudes towards violence as a cognitive element in scripts that incorporate the use of violence, stronger measures of attitudes are required. Specifically, the present research indicates that attitudes towards violence must be examined in relation to the gender of the target and gender-dynamic. With regard to more effectively measuring the gendered nature of attitudes towards violence, substantial improvements could be made by simply altering the nature of the questions that were asked to measure these attitudes. The questions used in the Conflict Questionnaire were all presented within the following framework: "suppose you are witness to an incident where one man punches an adult male stranger" (Kennedy and Forde 1999).

Respondents were then asked if they would approve of this behaviour in a number of different situations. For example:

- Would you approve if the adult stranger was in a protest march showing opposition to the other man's views?
- Would you approve if the adult stranger was drunk and bumped into the man and his wife on the street?
- Would you approve if the adult stranger had just broken into the man's house?

All of these questions ask about an adult male using force against another adult male stranger. To test for the effects of gender in relation to attitudes towards violence the general framework of the primary question could be altered to read: "suppose you are witness to an incident where one (male/female) punches an adult (male/female) stranger." In each case the gender of the parties involved could be randomized. Then, the gender of the target could be randomized in each of the situations posed to the respondents. For example:

- Would you approve if the adult (male/female) stranger was in a protest march showing opposition to the other (male's/female's) views?
- Would you approve if the adult (male/female) stranger was drunk and bumped into a couple in the street?
- Would you approve if the adult (male/female) stranger had just broken into the (male's/female's) house?

Posing the questions in this manner would allow for the examination of the effects of gender of the respondent, gender of the target and gender-dynamic. Using these measures could significantly improve our understanding the effects of gender in relation to attitudes towards violence. If the researcher desired, these questions could further be altered to test for the effects of relationship through randomization of this variable—

stranger, friend and spouse for example. Finally, the research could examine a number of different social contexts by altering key situational factors.

In addition to attitudes, past experiences with victimization—in particular violent victimization or even exposure to violent victimization—should be explored further in terms of how these experiences can influence behavioural scripts for dealing with future conflict situations. In terms of the development of scripts, significant insight could be acquired through the examination of specific types of samples such as juvenile offenders or violent offenders (including both juveniles and adults). These target groups could be interviewed in much greater detail with regard to their past exposure and experiences with violence in order to see how these experiences may or may not have influenced their current routines for dealing with conflict. It would further be interesting to look at a non-violent control group and question them about their ideas about the use of violence in conflict situations. The use of a control group would allow researchers to compare and contrast violent and non-violent groups in terms of their scripts (and the development of those scripts) for dealing with conflict.

With specific regard to the development and modification of routines, a longitudinal cohort study could be used to see if and how routines for dealing with conflict change over time. This methodology would allow researchers to find out if changes in routines are correlated with factors such as victimization, exposure to violence, and/or other important life events (Sampson and Laub 1993). In addition, researchers could look for consistencies (or lack there of) in routines across similar situations over time.

In addition to investigating the development of behavioural scripts, there is a need to acquire a stronger understanding of the social cues that trigger these scripts. This study has clearly demonstrated the significance of the gender of the target in triggering certain routines. Past research has also found other social cues that appear to be important in directing routines for dealing with conflict—for example, the presence of bystanders, alcohol consumption, weapons, and social setting (Felson 2000; Jurik and Winn 1990). Consequently, the continued exploration of these and other situational factors that can trigger the use of violence is critical to developing adequate models for the explanation of violence.

Hypothetical scenarios have been shown to be a good way to investigate the effects of situational factors and person characteristics together in the same model. However, future research that uses scenarios to examine gender, situation and violence can be improved by using a different variety of scenarios than were used in the present study. While there are many different types of conflict situations within which violence can occur, there are still some common threads in these incidents that can be examined. Scenarios can be developed to include several key factors that, on the basis of past research, seem to be related to violence. For example, researchers using scenarios should test for the effects of relationship between the parties (Felson 2000). This would allow for the examination of similarities and differences in the development and use of routines for dealing with conflicts involving strangers versus intimates for example.

Taking into account the findings from the present study and from past research, an example of how future research using hypothetical scenarios can be improved is presented below. As a means for investigating the relationship between gender, situation and violence, scenarios could include the following key variables:

1. Respondent Characteristics: gender, age, alcohol consumption, possession of a weapon;
2. Target Characteristics: gender, age, alcohol consumption, possession of a weapon;
3. Relationship: stranger, acquaintance, friend, romantic partner;
4. Social Setting: public or private place (e.g., home or a pub), characteristics such as lighting, and time of day;
5. Bystanders: present or absent, number, and gender;
6. Intensity: verbal or physical; and
7. Reason for the conflict.

This list is not exhaustive and depending on the research questions of interest, certain factors might be altered or excluded—for example, use of weapons, specific characteristics of the setting or the reason for the conflict. Two examples of scenarios with randomized conditions that could be used to test for the effects of some of the above listed variables are presented below.

Scenario One

> Let's say that you are at neighborhood pub (during the day/late at night). You have (had several drinks/nothing to drink). A (younger/middle-aged/elderly) (male/female) (stranger/ acquaintance/friend) that appears to be (sober/intoxicated) approaches you at your table. This person (yells insults at you/pushes you). There is (nobody around/two males at the next table, two females at the next table/a couple at the next table). This person (has a weapon, does not have a weapon) and you (have a weapon/do not have a weapon). You (have had trouble with this person in the past/have not had trouble in the past).

Based on the above scenario, a respondent might be read the following:

> Let's say that you are at neighborhood pub late at night. You have had nothing to drink. A young female stranger that appears to be intoxicated approaches you at your table and pushes you. There are two males sitting at the next table. This person has a weapon but you do not have a weapon. You have not had any trouble with this person in the past.

Scenario Two

> Let's say that you are (having a party at home/attending a party at a friend's place) in the (afternoon/at night). You have (had several drinks/nothing to drink). Your (young/middle-aged/elderly) (male/female) (acquaintance/friend/spouse) that appears to be (sober/intoxicated) approaches you and (yells insults at you/pushes you). There is (nobody around/two couples present/children present). This person (has a weapon, does not have a weapon) and you (have a weapon/do not have a weapon). You (have had trouble with this person in the past/have not had trouble in the past).

Based on the above scenario, a respondent might be read the following:

> Let's say you are having a party at home in the afternoon. You have had several drinks. Your young male friend who appears to be intoxicated approaches you and yells at you. There is nobody around. This person does not appear to have a weapon but you do have a weapon. You have had trouble with this person in the past.

These scenarios are simply examples and could be modified in a number of different ways to address specific research questions. For example, if the researcher is interested in weapons, the kind of weapon could be specified—a knife, a gun, a frying pan and so on. Similarly, if the researcher is not interested in weapons this variable could be removed. For another example, if the researcher is interested in the reason for the conflict as a factor, the nature of the *past trouble* could be specified.

The most important recommendation that can be made in regard to using hypothetical scenarios is that they should be as realistic as possible. For instance, while it makes sense that a gun might appear within the context of a robbery scenario, a gun—or any other type of weapon—may not be realistic in other types of scenarios. In addition to ensuring the realism of the scenarios, if the researcher is going to use a number of scenarios, as was the case in the present study, it is important that a key set of variables (e.g., gender, relationship, social setting, intensity) be included in each scenario. This allows for the examination of effects across scenarios, rather than simply within a particular scenario. The goal is to have the ability to make generalized conclusions about the effects of person and situation characteristics across a number of different kinds of scenarios. The ability to predict violence in a very specific type of situation is clearly not as valuable as being able to predict violence in a variety of situations. If we can determine a core set of variables that relate to routines for violence across a number of different types of situations it will then be possible to develop generalized strategies for changing those routines.

In addition to hypothetical scenarios there are other methods that could be employed to measure willingness to use force as a means for dealing with conflict. Given the fact that there are clear ethical limitations associated with placing individuals in actual situations of conflict to see how they react, researchers need to be creative. One possibility for injecting realism into this kind of research would be to hire people to act out various scenarios, which could be videotaped and then shown to research subjects. As with the hypothetical scenarios, these filmed scenarios could vary in terms of gender-dynamic, age combinations, intensity and social setting. The research subjects could then be asked how *they* would respond in such situations.

In questioning subjects about how they would respond, several different methods could be used. The tape could be shown to an individual subject who would then be interviewed by the researcher. A second option would be to show the tape to an individual subject and then have the subject fill out a questionnaire. A third alternative would be to present the tape to a focus group representing a variety of demographics (e.g., gender, age). A discussion about the tape could then be held with the focus group.

Arguably, each method has its strengths and limitations. For example, people might be more honest in a questionnaire situation, while the focus group would be more dynamic and might encourage people to consider other viewpoints. A final option would be to use all three methods and then comparisons could be made with regard to the results.

Another idea for examining the effects of gender in relation to violence would be to have respondents volunteer to partake in role-playing activities where they themselves participate in a staged situation of conflict. This methodology would directly involve the respondents and might therefore be more realistic for them than observing other people in a video. This type of an experiment might encourage research subjects to think more critically about their own routines for dealing with conflict.

It is fair to say that the empirical testing of integrated models of violence that include an examination of respondent characteristics, target characteristics and social context is not an easy task. In fact, the difficulty associated with doing this kind of research is likely a primary reason behind the decision of many researchers to focus on one aspect or another as opposed to attempting to conduct integrated analyses. Nevertheless, good research cannot be data driven—it must be theory driven. Rather, as researchers we need to be more creative in our work. While the use of hypothetical scenarios and other methods have their limitations, they also open up many opportunities for research that could not otherwise be carried out.

In addition to the ongoing investigation of the combined and interaction effects between person characteristics and situational factors, future research should continue to examine the roots of gendered norms for behaviour and how they impact on routines for dealing with conflict. Specifically, more effort should be placed on how society determines and transmits appropriate behaviours for males and females and how masculine and feminine norms influence behaviour at the level of *situations.* If socialization can prevent males from using force against females in certain situations, it is possible to work towards socializing both males and females to define physical force as an unacceptable means for dealing with conflict regardless of the gender of the target or the situation.

In sum, the more that can be learned about the development of violent scripts, as well as the social cues that trigger those scripts in situations, the more we can do to transform violent scripts into non-violent scripts or routines for dealing with conflict.

ENDNOTES

---

[1] The measurement strategy for the current study involves placing individuals into artificial scenarios. As a result, this research cannot examine the relationship between person characteristics and situation selection.

[2] The dependent variable for this study, *Aggression*, is operationalized as reported willingness to use physical force.

[3] As will be discussed in the following chapters, research is beginning to examine the Person X Situation models more frequently. However, the current study brings together a distinct combination of variables and interaction terms in a manner that, to the best of the knowledge of the researcher, has not been carried out before.

[4] The works of Lombroso (1895) and Pollack (1950) represent exceptions, however, their work focused primarily on *sex* differences as opposed to gender differences.

[5] Interestingly, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990: 149) also state in their book that "it is beyond the scope of this work (and beyond the reach of any available set of empirical data) to attempt to identify all of the elements responsible for gender differences in crime." They do not expand on what they mean by other "elements."

[6] It is important to note that within the field of criminology the relationship between belief systems and violence has been discussed in terms of the subcultural perspective (Kennedy and Forde 1999). This perspective suggests that certain beliefs or values may actually legitimize violence under certain circumstances—in other words, it may be considered normative.

[7] It should be noted that *Fear of Crime* may have an influence on situation selection; however, this cannot be tested in the current study.

[8] As was the case with *Fear of Crime*, *Past Victimization* may also influence situation selection (which cannot be tested in this study).

[9] The current study relies on hypothetical scenarios and therefore cannot investigate actual consequences of these situations for the respondents. However, in the original study, Kennedy and Forde (1999) did question respondents about the consequences of real life conflict situations they had experienced.

[10] A distinction needs to be made between the theoretical concept of social interactionism and the statistically oriented 'interactionist position' adopted by this study. The 'interactionist position' as borrowed from social psychology refers to the general approach or model for this study, which entails an examination of the statistical interaction effects of person and situation variables in violence. In contrast, social interactionism is a theoretical perspective relating to the content of violent behaviour.

[11] Kennedy and Forde (1996, 1999) operationalize naming as 'Upset'. This is also the case in the present study.

[12] Kennedy and Forde (1999) also cite some scenario level differences in order to illustrate that their effects vary by domain and setting.

[13] While this study will only examine one dependent variable (*Aggression*), *Upset* will be included in the model as a predictor variable, while *Claiming* is a constant in the prediction of aggression.

---

[14] As will be discussed in Chapter Three, in contrast to the present study, Forde and Kennedy (1997) measured self-control in terms of six separate factors, rather than as a composite scale.

[15] In terms of self-control, the current study overlaps with that of Forde and Kennedy (1997) to the extent that the effects of *Low Self-Control* on *Aggression* are examined. However, the present study will extend beyond their research by examining the effects of *Low Self-Control* in conjunction with other person and situational level variables. Forde and Kennedy (1997) did not examine the effects of *Low Self-Control* on *Aggression* in conjunction with specific situational conditions, nor did they examine these effects in conjunction with other person characteristics or their interaction with situational factors such as the intensity of the situation.

[16] It is important to note that *Upset* can actually be considered both a person characteristic and a situational variable in that *Upset* is dependent on who the individual is as well as the nature of the situation.

[17] Variables that were not significant in the pooled regression analysis conducted by Kennedy and Forde (1999) may still be included in the present analysis when the literature review indicates that those variables are theoretically important.

[18] Hypothesis number ten necessitates the inclusion of all lower order interaction terms in the model as well. Consequently, in addition to the *Gender of Respondent* by *Gender of Harm Doer* interaction already tested by Kennedy and Forde (1996) across all scenarios, the current analysis will include the potential interactions between gender of harm doer and alone, and gender of respondent and alone.

[19] In other words, while individuals with low self-control will be more likely to use physical force overall this pattern will be most evident in high *Intensity* situations.

[20] In order for the respondent to be selected they had to be over the age of 18 years and the household had to be their regular place of residence.

[21] A comparison with census data shows that the socio-demographic profile of the respondents is representative of individuals living in Alberta and Manitoba (Kennedy and Forde 1999).

[22] In both provinces the final samples obtained for each area were not proportional to their representative populations. As a result, Kennedy and Forde (1999) weighted the samples for the purposes of their analyses. A detailed description of the sampling procedures and the calculation of the sample weights is provided in Kennedy and Forde (1999). For the current analyses, however, the samples are not weighted.

[23] Kennedy and Forde (1999) presented respondents with a modified version of the self-control scale developed by Grasmick et al. (1993). This scale has been subjected to additional modifications for the purposes of the current research.

[24] As will be discussed later, *Claiming* is a 'filter' question. Only those respondents who report that they would make a claim are asked about whether or not they would be willing to use aggression. The same is not true of *Upset* (*Naming*) however. All respondents were asked if they would make a claim, regardless of whether or not they were upset.

[25] For example, issues relating to telescoping and memory loss are decreased.

[26] These researchers also examined the relationships between *Upset*, *Claiming* and *Aggression* (Kennedy and Forde 1999).

---

[27] Again, the same is not true for *Upset*. This variable can remain in the model because all respondents were asked if they would make a claim, regardless of whether or not they were *Upset*.

[28] See Kennedy and Forde (1997) for an empirical justification of this assumption.

[29] Forde and Kennedy (1997) set the eigenvalue at 1.0 for the extraction of factors in the principal-components analysis. The eigenvalues for each factor were: *Simple Tasks* (3.74); *Risk Seeking* (2.37); *Temper* (1.97); *Physical Activity* (1.52); *Self-Centered* (1.29); and *Impulsivity* (1.08).

[30] It is important to note that the debate over the unidimensionality of the scale developed by Grasmick et al. (1993) has yet to be resolved. Several studies have examined this issue and have produced mixed results (Grasmick et al. 1993; Arneklev et al. 1993; Nagin and Paternoster 1993; Hirschi and Gottfredson 1993; Piquero and Rosay 1997; Burton et al. 1998; Longshore, Stein, and Turner 1998; LaGrange and Silverman 1999; Sellers 1999; Nakhaie et al. 2000). For example, Nagin and Paternoster (1993) who used Grasmick et al.'s (1993: 478) scale state that "although the instrument measures six different elements or dimensions of self-control, the construct was intended to be unidimensional." In a test of the reliability of the Grasmick et al. (1993) scale, Piquero and Rosay (1997: 169) found that the scale "can conform to a one factor solution." At the same time, some research suggests that certain components of low self-control may be more powerful than the concept of self-control itself, thus raising some doubt as to the unidimensionality of the scale (Arneklev et al. 1993; Longshore et al. 1998; Piquero et al. 2000). In adding to the complexity of measuring self-control, Arneklev et al. (1993: 233) state that "Gottfredson and Hirschi's formulation implies that each of the six separately and all six combined, should predict imprudent behaviour." Altogether, Hirschi and Gottfredson (1990) do not suggest that unidimensionality is necessitated by their theory; nonetheless, they do indicate that the six primary elements of self-control tend to come together in the same people (see also Grasmick et al. 1993; Arneklev et al. 1993; Burton et al. 1998).

[31] In view of the lower than anticipated alpha score, it may be argued by some that *Attitudes Towards Violence* would be more accurately conceived as an index rather than a scale. In developing composite measures, some writers do make a distinction between indexes and scales; however, many researchers do not differentiate between the two at all (Vogt 1999). Ultimately though, whether *Attitudes Towards Violence* represents a scale or an index, this composite measure will still produce a score that can be used as an indication of respondents' tolerance of the use of violence as a means for dealing with conflict.

[32] In addition, the construction of this scale is acceptable based on the assumption that agreement with the residual and defensive statements is more likely than agreement with the violent statements. Thus, individuals with the highest scores are more likely to have agreed with the violent statements as well, which can further be assumed to indicate a higher tolerance for violence overall.

[33] Only 15 cases are coded as missing.

[34] It is important to note that dummy variables could be created to test for relationships between each individual type of victimization and the use of force in the scenarios.

However, as will be demonstrated, *Past Victimization* and the dummy variable created to examine assaults separately from other types of victimization were not found to be significant. It is suspected that the results would be the same for other types of victimization because of the manner in which this variable has been operationalized. Respondents were only asked to report their most serious victimization ever and there is no indication of the frequency of the victimization.

[35] A review of the scenarios shows that in relation to being alone or with friends, the object of attack also varies. The *Harm Doer* may target either the respondent or another person if the respondent is not alone. This variable has been excluded from the current analyses for two reasons. First, the object of attack is only relevant when the respondents are not alone in their scenarios (if they are alone they cannot be questioned about the object of attack). Second, preliminary investigations revealed that the object of attack was not a significant factor in the willingness to use force in situations where the respondent was not alone.

[36] Interaction terms were created through the multiplication of the centered predictor variables.

[37] This interaction term also necessitates the inclusion of the three lower-order interaction terms that make up this three-way interaction term. These include the interaction *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer*, *Gender of Respondent* and *Respondent Alone*, and the interaction *Gender of Harm Doer* and *Respondent Alone*.

[38] Given the fact that the predictor variables are centered, multicollinearity should not be a problem in the current analyses. Nevertheless, to test for this possibility, a correlation matrix was created for all of the variables analysed. The only correlations that are strong enough to draw attention (i.e., correlations greater than .6) relate to those variables that are interaction terms or are included in interaction terms—these variables are expected to be more highly correlated. Consequently, multicollinearity is not considered to be a significant problem in any of the four Trials.

[39] Homoscedasticity refers to equality of variances in the dependent variable for corresponding values of the independent variable among the different groups or populations being examined (Vogt 1998).

[40] The natural log is raised to the B1 power (Garson 2001). The natural logarithm refers to the use of base *e*, (2.71828), an irrational number.

[41] If desired, the exponentiated coefficients can also be transformed to reflect the percentage increase or decrease in the dependent variable based on a one-unit change in the corresponding independent variable. This percentage is calculated by taking the exponentiated coefficient, subtracting 1 and multiplying by 100 (Pampel 2001).

[42] There are a total of 270 missing cases on the self-control scale, which is not insignificant. However, it is difficult to determine whether the 'don't know' response is a methodological or a theoretical issue or both. On the one hand, it could be that the same respondents are responding 'don't know' as a means for speeding up the interview, thus indicating a methodological concern. On the other hand, there could be some interesting arguments put forth regarding the theoretical significance of a response of 'don't know'. While these issues will not be explored in detail at this time, this group of respondents

---

could prove to be an interesting group to examine at a later time. The issue of the potential impact of these missing cases on the analysis is dealt with in Chapter Four.

[43] The number of missing cases for *Attitudes Towards Violence* is 265, which again, is not insignificant. However, as with *Low Self-Control*, it is difficult to determine whether the missing responses are a methodological or a theoretical issue or both. This issue is beyond the scope of the current project.

[44] Recall that respondents were only asked to report their most serious victimization experience ever. Multiple responses were not possible.

[45] This third interaction term also necessitates the inclusion of the three lower-order interaction terms that make up this three-way interaction term. These include the interaction *Gender of Respondent* and *Gender of Harm Doer*, *Gender of Respondent* and *Respondent Alone*, and the interaction *Gender of Harm Doer* and *Respondent Alone*.

[46] To test for potential variation by type of victimization, subsequent analyses were conducted for those individuals who reported having been a victim of assault to see if this type of victimization would increase or decrease the likelihood of use of force in future situations. The relationship was not significant in any of the four Trials. Consequently, the dummy variable created for *Past Victimization* (discussed in Chapter Three) will not be included in the final model.

[47] Kennedy and Forde (1999) report variation in level of aggression by scenario. In addition, they examine select scenarios with regard to the effects of intensity. Finally, they present results from a pooled regression analysis—across all scenarios—which speak to general variation by gender of respondent as well as select other person and situation characteristics. However, these researchers did not examine variation in the effects of gender-dynamic and other factors included in the current study by domain or by scenario.

[48] It is important to restate that differences in the use of physical force by scenario and by domain were revealed in the original study conducted by Kennedy and Forde (1999) using these data. However, these researchers did not examine these domains and scenarios in terms of variation in the effects of person and situation characteristics as is being done in the current study.

[49] Subsequent analyses of the remaining scenarios from the Work Domain showed that *Worker Scenario* is not significant in the model, however, *Customer Scenario* is significant (B= -1.104**). Respondents were less likely to report that they would be willing to use physical force in the *Customer Scenario* as compared to other scenarios in the Work Domain.

[50] Subsequent analyses of the remaining scenarios in the Street Domain found that *Store Scenario* is not significant in the model, however, *Traffic Accident Scenario* is highly significant (B= -2.775***). Respondents reported that they would be much less willing to use physical force in the *Traffic Accident Scenario* as compared to other scenarios from the Street Domain.

[51] Subsequent analyses of the remaining scenarios in the Domestic Domain found that both *Spousal Scenario* (B=.465*) and *Neighbor Scenario* (B= -3.875***) are significant. Respondents said that they would be more willing to use force in the *Spousal Scenario* as

---

compared to other scenarios from the Domestic Domain while they would be much less likely to use force in the Neighbor Scenario.

[52] Subsequent analyses of the remaining scenarios from the *Leisure Domain* show that the *Pub Scenario* is not significant, however, *Vacation Scenario* does have a significant effect in the model (B= -1.162***). Respondents say that they would be less willing to use physical force in the *Vacation Scenario* as compared to other scenarios from the Leisure Domain.

[53] It is important to recall at this point that initial analyses for Trial Three presented in Chapter Four suggested that the effects of gender might be different in Trial Three (which is dominated by the Domestic Domain) than in other Trials. More specifically, it was implied that there might be an interactive effect between gender and domain; however, this has not been supported here.

[54] Recall that in Trial Two, when *Robbery Scenario* was added to the model, *Gender of Harm Doer* was no longer significant.

[55] *Gender of Harm Doer* and the interaction term will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter.

[56] To pursue this non-finding further, an interaction term was created to represent a possible interaction between *Gender of Respondent* and *Age of Respondent*; however, this interaction term was not significant.

[57] Subsequent analyses of the Conflict Data not presented in this thesis showed that males are more likely than females to hold positive attitudes towards violence.

[58] It is important to recall that in the majority of scenarios in Trial Four, respondents are not alone.

[59] The interaction terms *Gender of Respondent * Alone* and *Gender of Harm Doer * Alone* were included in the model because they are lower order terms stemming from *Gender * Gender * Alone*. Neither of these interaction terms were significant in any of the four Trials.

[60] It is important to recall that it was initially hypothesized that there would be an interaction between *Gender of Harm Doer* and *Intensity*, however, this term was not significant in any of the four Trials.

[61] The exception to this is the two *Gender of Respondent* interaction terms that were found in Trial Three.

REFERENCES

Adler, F. 1975. *Sisters in Crime*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Aiken, L.A., and S.G. West. 1991. *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Akers, R.L. 1994. *Criminological Theories: Introduction and Evaluation*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.

———1991. "Self-Control as a General Theory of Crime." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 7(2): 201-211.

Allen, M. 1998. "Methodological Considerations When Examining a Gendered World." In D. J. Canary and K. Dindia (eds.), *Sex Differences and Similarities in Communication: Critical Essays and Empirical Investigations of Sex and Gender In Interaction*. Mahwah, Mahwah New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Arneklev, B.J., H.G. Grasmick, C.R. Tittle, and R.J. Bursik Jr. 1993. "Low Self-control and Imprudent Behavior". *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 9(3): 225-247.

Atwood, J.D. (ed.). 1996. *Family Scripts*. Washington, DC: Accelerated Development.

Babbie, E. 1989. *The Practice of Social Research*, 5th Edition. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Ball-Rokeach, S.J. 1973. "Values and Violence: A Test of the Subculture of Violence Thesis". *American Sociological Review* 38: 736.

Barlow, H.D. 1991. "Explaining Crimes and Analogous Acts, or the Unrestrained Will Grab at Pleasure Whenever They Can." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 82(1): 229-242.

Baron, S.W., D.R. Forde, and L.W. Kennedy. 2001. "Rough Justice: Street Youth and Violence." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 16(7): 662-678.

———, L.W. Kennedy & D.R. Forde. 2001. "Male Street Youths' Conflict: The Role of Background, Subcultural and Situational Factors." *Justice Quarterly* 18(4): 759-789.

Baskin, D., and I.B. Sommers. 1998. *Casualties of Community Disorder: Women's Careers In Violent Crime.* Westview Press: A Division of Harper Collins Publishers.

Beaman, L.G. 2000. *New Perspectives on Deviance: The Construction of Deviance in Everyday Life.* Scarborough: Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon Canada.

Belknap, J. 1996. *The Invisible Woman: Gender, Crime and Justice.* Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing.

Ben-David, S. 1993. "The Two Facets of Female Violence: The Public and the Domestic Domains." *Journal of Family Violence* 8(4): 345-359.

Berkowitz, L. 1986. "Some Varieties of Human Aggression: Criminal Violence as Coercion, Rule-Following, Impression Management and Impulsive Behavior." In A. Campbell and J.J. Gibbs (eds.), *Violent Transactions: The Limits of Personality.* New York: Basil Blackwell.

Besserer, S., and C. Trainor. 2000. "Criminal Victimization in Canada, 1999." *Juristat* 20(10): 1-27.

Birkbeck, C., and G. LaFree. 1993. "The Situational Analysis of Crime and Deviance." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19: 113-37.

Boritch, H. 1996. *Fallen Women: Female Crime and Criminal Justice in Canada.* Toronto: ITP Nelson.

Brownfield, D., and A.M. Sorenson. 1993. "Self-control and Juvenile Delinquency: Theoretical Issues and an Empirical Assessment of Selected elements of a General Theory of Crime." *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 14: 243-264.

Brownstein, H.H. 2000. *The Social Reality of Violence and Violent Crime*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bursik, R.J., and Y. Baba. 1986. "Individual Variations in Crime-Related Decisions." *Social Science Research* 15: 71-81.

Burton, V.S. Jr., F. T. Cullen, T.D. Evans, L.F. Alarid, and R.G. Dunaway. 1998. "Gender, Self-Control, and Crime." *Journal of Research In Crime and Delinquency* 35(2): 123-147.

Buss, A.R. 1981. "The Trait-Situation Controversy and the Concept of Interaction." In A. Furnham and M. Argyle (eds), *The Psychology of Social Situations: Selected Readings*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Campbell, A. 1986. "Overview." In A. Campbell and J.J. Gibbs (eds), *Violent Transactions: The Limits of Personality*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

———1986B. "The Streets and Violence." In A. Campbell and J.J. Gibbs (eds), *Violent Transactions: The Limits of Personality*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

———, and S. Muncer. 1998. "Female-Female Criminal Assault: An Evolutionary Perspective." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 35(4): 413-429.

Carter, G.L. 1991. "Teaching the Idea of Contextual Effects." *Teaching Sociology* 19: 526-531.

Clarke, R.V.G. 1981. "'Situational' Crime Prevention: Theory and Practice." In A. Furnham and M. Argyle (eds), *The Psychology of Social Situations: Selected Readings*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

———, and M. Felson. 1993. "Introduction: Criminology, Routine Activity and Rational Choice." In R.V. Clarke and M. Felson (eds.), *Routine Activity and Rational Choice*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Chesney-Lind, M. 1989. "Girls' Crime and Woman's Place: Toward a Feminist Model of Female Delinquency." *Crime and Delinquency* 35(1): 5-29.

Cohen, L.E., and M. Felson. 1979. "Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activities approach." *American Sociological Review* 44: 588-608.

Cornish, D.B. 1993. "Theories of Action in Criminology: Learning Theory and Rational Choice Approaches." In L.E. Clarke and M. Felson (eds), *Routine Activity and Rational Choice: Advances In Criminological Theory*. New Brunswick (U.S.A): Transaction Publishers.

———, and R.V.G. Clarke, (eds.). 1986. *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Curran, D.J., and C. M. Renzetti. 1994. *Theories of Crime*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Daly, K., and M. Chesney-Lind. 1988. "Feminism and Criminology." *Justice Quarterly* 5(4): 497-538.

Dauvergne, M. 2002. "Homicide in Canada, 2001." *Juristat* 22(7): 1-20.

Dent, D. Z., and I. Arias. 1990. "Effects of Alcohol, Gender, and Role of Spouses on Attributions and Evaluations of Marital Violence Scenarios." *Violence and Victims* 5(3): 185-193.

Eagly, A. H., and M. Crowley. 1986. "Gender and Helping Behaviour: A Meta-Analytic Review of the Social Psychological Literature". *Psychological Bulletin* 100(3): 283-308.

Endler, N. S. 1981. "The Case for Person-Situation Interactions." In A. Furnham and M. Argyle (eds), *The Psychology of Social Situations: Selected Readings*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Epstein, S. 1979. "The Stability of Behavior: On Predicting Most of the People Much of the Time." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 37(7): 1097-1126.

Evans, D.T., F.T. Cullen, V. S. Burton, JR., R.G. Dunaway and M.L. Benson. 1997. "The Social Consequences of Self-control: Testing the General Theory of Crime." *Criminology* 35(3): 475-504.

Fattah, E.A. 1993. "The Rational Choice/Opportunity Perspectives as a Vehicle for Integrating Criminological and Victimological Theories." In L.E. Clarke and M. Felson (eds), *Routine Activity and Rational Choice: Advances In Criminological Theory*. New Brunswick (U.S.A): Transaction Publishers.

——— 1991. *Understanding Criminal Victimization*. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.

Fawcett, B., B. Featherstone, J. Hearn and C. Toft (eds.). 1996. *Violence and Gender Relations: Theories and Interventions*. London: Sage Publications.

Felson, R.B. 2002. *Violence & Gender Reexamined*. Washington D.C: American Psychological Association.

———2000. "The Normative Protection of Women From Violence." *Sociological Forum* 15(1): 91-115.

———1996. "Big People Hit Little People: Sex Differences in Physical Power and Interpersonal Violence." *Criminology* 34(3): 433-452.

———1993. "Predatory and Dispute-Related Violence: A Social Interactionist Approach." In L.E. Clarke and M. Felson (eds), *Routine Activity and Rational Choice: Advances In Criminological Theory*. New Brunswick (U.S.A): Transaction Publishers.

———, W. Baccaglini, and G. Gmelch. 1986. "Bar-room Brawls: Aggression and Violence in Irish and American Bars." In A. Campbell and J.J. Gibbs (eds), *Violent Transactions*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

———, and S.F. Messner. 1998. "Disentangling the Effects of Gender and Intimacy On Victim Precipitation In Homicide." *Criminology* 36 (2): 405-424.

———, and S.F. Messner. 1996. "To Kill Or Not To Kill? Lethal Outcomes in Injurious Attacks." *Criminology* 34(4): 519-545.

———, and H.J. Steadman. 1983. "Situational Factors in Disputes Leading to Criminal Violence." *Criminology* 21(1): 59-74.

———, and J.T. Tedeschi (eds.). 1993. *Aggression and Violence: Social Interactionist Perspectives.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Felstiner, W.L.F., R.L. Abel and A. Smart. 1980-81. "The Emergence and Transformation of Disputes: Naming, Blaming, and Claiming." *Law and Society Review* 15(3-4): 631.

Fishbein, M., and I. Ajzen. 1975. *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research.* Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Forde, D., and L. Kennedy. 1997. "Risky Lifestyles, Routine Activities, and the General Theory of Crime." *Justice Quarterly* 14: 265-94.

Forgas, J.P. 1986. "Cognitive Representations of Aggressive Situations." In A. Campbell and J.J. Gibbs (eds.), *Violent Transactions: The Limits of Personality.* New York: Basil Blackwell.

Furnham, A., and M. Argyle. 1981. "Interactional Psychology: Introduction." In A. Furnham and M. Argyle (eds), *The Psychology of Social Situations: Selected Readings.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Garson, D. *Logistic Regression.* http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/logistic.htm

George, D., and P. Mallery. 2000. *SPSS For Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference (9.0 Update)*, 2nd ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Gibbs, J.J. 1986. "Overview." In A. Campbell and J. J. Gibbs (eds), *Violent Transactions: The Limits of Personality.* New York: Basil Blackwell.

———1986. "Alcohol Consumption, Cognition and Context: Examining Tavern Violence." In A. Campbell and J. J. Gibbs (eds), *Violent Transactions: The Limits of Personality.* New York: Basil Blackwell.

Goto, S. 1996. "To Trust or Not To Trust: Situational and Dispositional Determinants." *Social Behavior and Personality* 24(2): 119-132.

Gottfredson, M., and T. Hirschi. 1990. *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Grasmick, H.G., C.R. Tittle, R.J. Bursik, Jr., and B.J. Arneklev. 1993. "Testing the Core Empirical Implications of Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30(1): 5-29.

Grimm, L.G. and P.R. Yarnold (eds.). 1995. *Reading and Understanding Multivariate Statistics*. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Gwynn, C. 1993. "Women and crime: The failure of traditional theories and the rise of feminist criminology." *Monash University Law Review* 19(1): 92-103.

Hare, R. 1993. *Without Conscience: The Disturbing World of the Psychopaths Among Us*. New York: Pocket Books.

Harris, M.B. 1991. "Effects of Sex of Aggressor, Sex of Target, and Relationship on Evaluations of Physical Aggression." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 6(2): 174-186.

Harrison, D. 2000. "Violence In the Military Community". In L.G. Beaman (ed.), *New Perspectives On Deviance: The Construction of Deviance In Everyday Life*. Scarborough: Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon Canada.

Hawkins, D.J., T. Herrenkohl, D.P. Farrington, D. Brewer, R.F. Catalano, and T.W. Harachi. 1998. "A Review of Predictors of Youth Violence." In R. Loeber and D.P. Farrington (eds.), *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications

Hindelang, M.J., M.R. Gottfredson, and J. Garofalo. 1978. *Victims of Personal Crime: An Empirical Foundation for a Theory of Personal Crime*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Hirschi, T., and M. Gottfredson. 1986. "The Distinction Between Crime and Criminality". In T. F. Hartnagel and R. A. Silverman (eds.), *Critique and Explanation: Essays in Honor of Gwynne Nettler*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

Hoaken, P.N.S., and R.O. Pihl. 2000. "The Effects of Alcohol Intoxication on Aggressive Responses in Men and Women." *Alcohol and Alcoholism* 35(5): 471-477.

Jurik, N.C., and R.Winn. 1990. "Gender and Homicide: A Comparison of Men and Women Who Kill." *Violence and Victims* 5(4): 227-241.

Kim, M., and J. Hunter. 1993. "Relationships Among Attitudes, Behavioral Intentions and Behavior: A Meta-Analysis of Past Research. Part 2." *Communications Research* 20: 331-64.

Keane, C., P.S. Maxim, and J.J. Teevan. 1993. "Drinking and Driving, Self-control, and Gender: Testing A General Theory of Crime." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30(1): 30-46.

Kennedy, L.W., and D.R. Forde. 1999. *When Push Comes To Shove: A Routine Conflict Approach To Violence*. Albany: Suny Press.

———1996. "Pathways to Aggression: A Factorial Survey of "Routine Conflict." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 12(4): 417-438.

Koski, P.R., and W.D. Mangold. 1988. "Gender Effects in Attitudes About Family Violence." *Journal of Family Violence* 3(3): 225.

Kruttschnitt, C. 1994. "Gender and Interpersonal Violence." In A.J. Reiss, Jr., and J.A. Roth, (eds.), *Understanding and Preventing Violence: Social Influences (Volume 3)*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

———1993. "Violence By and Against Women: A Comparative and Cross-National Analysis." *Violence and Victims* 8(3): 253-270.

LaGrange, T.C., and R.A. Silverman. 1999. "Low Self-Control and Opportunity: Testing the General Theory of Crime as An Explanation For Gender Differences In Delinquency." *Criminology* 37(1): 41-72.

LaFree, G., and C. Birkbeck. 1991. "The Neglected Situation: A Cross-National Study of the Situational Characteristics of Crime." *Criminology* 29(1): 73-97.

Laner, M.R., M.H. Benin, and N.A. Ventrone. 2001. "Bystander Attitudes Toward Victims of Violence: Who's Worth Helping?" *Deviant Behavior* 42: 23-42.

Levin, J., and J.A. Fox. 1985. *Mass Murder: America's Growing Menace*. New York: Plenum Press.

Luckenbill, D.F. 1977. "Criminal Homicide as A Situated Transaction." *Social Problems* 25(2): 176.

———, and D.P. Doyle. 1989. "Structural Position and Violence: Developing a Cultural Explanation." *Criminology* 27(3): 419.

Magnusson, D. 1981. "An Analysis of Situational Dimensions". In A. Furnham and M. Argyle (eds.), *The Psychology of Social Situations: Selected Readings*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

———, and B. Ekehammar. 1981. "Similar Situations—Similar Behaviors?" In A. Furnham and M. Argyle (eds.), *The Psychology of Social Situations: Selected Readings*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Malloy, T.E., and D.A. Kenny. 1986. "The Social Relations Model: An Integrative Method for Personality Research." *Journal of Personality* 54(1): 199-225.

Markowitz, F.E., and R.B. Felson. 1998. "Social-Demographic Attitudes and Violence." *Criminology* 36(1): 117-138.

Marvell, T.B., and C.E. Moody. 1999. "Female and Male Homicide Victimization Rates: Comparing Trends and Regressors." *Criminology* 37(4): 879-900.

Menard, S. 2001. *Applied Logistic Regression Analysis*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Merton, R.K. 1938. "Social Structure and Anomie." *American Sociological Review* 3: 672-682.

Messerschmidt, J.W. 1997. *Crime As Structured Action: Gender, Race, Class, and Crime in the Making*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

———1993. *Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Miethe, T.D., and R.F. Meier. 1994. *Crime and Its Social Context: Toward an Integrated Theory of Offenders, Victims, and Situations*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Miethe, T.D., M.C. Stafford, and J.S. Long. 1987. "Social Differentiation in Criminal Victimization: A test of routine activities/lifestyle theories." *American Sociological Review* 52: 184-194.

Moffitt, T.E., R.F. Krueger, A. Caspi, and J. Fagan. 2000. "Partner Abuse and General Crime: How are they the Same? How are they Different?" *Criminology* 38(1): 199-232.

Moskowitz, D.S. 1993. "Dominance and Friendliness: On the Interaction of Gender and Situation." *Journal of Personality* 61(3): 387-409.

Nagin, D.S., and R. Paternoster. 1993. "Enduring Individual Differences and Rational Choice Theories." *Law and Society Review* 27(3): 467-496.

Nakhaie, M. R., R.A. Silverman and T.C. LaGrange. 2000. "Self-Control and Social Control: An Examination of Gender, Ethnicity, Class and Delinquency". *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 25(1): 35-59.

Nettler, G. 1978. *Explaining Crime* 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Norusis, M.J. 2000. *SPSS 10.0: Guide to Data Analysis*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Pamco Publishing Company Inc. 1992. *New Illustrated Webster's Dictionary and Thesaurus.*

Pampel, F.C. 2001. *Logistic Regression: A Primer*. Thousand Oaks: A Sage University Paper.

Pervin, L. 1981. "A Free-Response Description Approach to the Analysis of Person-Situation Interaction." In A. Furnham and M. Argyle (eds.), *The Psychology of Social Situations: Selected Readings*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

———1986. "Persons, Situations, Interactions: Perspectives on a Recurrent Issue." In A. Campbell and J.J. Gibbs (eds.), *Violent Transactions: The Limits of Personality*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Piquero, A.R., R.MacIntosh, and M. Hickman. 2000. "Does Self-Control Affect Survey Response? Applying Exploratory, Confirmatory, and Item Response Theory Analysis to Grasmick et al.'s Self Control Scale." *Criminology* 38(3): 897-930.

———, and A.B. Rosay. 1997. "The Reliability and Validity of Grasmick et al.'s Self-Control Scale: A Comment on Longshore et al." *Criminology* 36(1): 157-173.

———, and S. Tibbetts. 1996. "Specifying the Direct and Indirect Effects of Low Self-control and Situational Factors in Offenders Decision Making: Toward a More Complete Model of Rational Offending." *Justice Quarterly* 13(3): 481-507.

Pollack, O. 1950. *The Criminality of Women*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Pratt, T.C., and F.T. Cullen. 2000. "The Empirical Status of Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime: A Meta-Analysis." *Criminology* 38(3): 931-964.

Price, R. H., and D. L. Bouffard. 1982. "Behavioral Appropriateness and Situational Constraint as Dimensions of Social Behavior." In A. Furnham and M. Argyle (eds.), *The Psychology of Social Situations: Selected Readings.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Pryor, J.B., J.L. Giedd, and K.B. Williams. 1995. "A Social Psychological Model for Predicting Sexual Harassment." *Journal of Social Issues* 1(1): 69-84.

Rodrigues, G.P. (ed.). 1993. *Pocket Criminal Code.* Ontario: Thomson Professional Publishing.

Ross, L., and R.E. Nisbett. 1991. *The Person and the Situation: Perspectives of Social Psychology.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Rossi, P.H. and S.S. Nock. 1982. Measuring Social Judgements: *The Factorial Survey Approach.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Sagrestano, L.M., C.L. Heavy, and A. Christensen. 1998. "Theoretical Approaches to Understanding Sex Differences and Similarities in Conflict Behavior". In D.J. Canary and K. Dindia (eds.), *Sex Differences and Similarities in Communication: Critical Essays and Empirical Investigations of Sex and Gender In Interaction.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers: Mahwah, New Jersey.

Sampson, R. J., and J. Laub. 1993. *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

______, and J.L. Lauritsen. 1994. "Violent Victimization and Offending: Individual-, Situational-, and Community-Level Risk Factors." In A.J. Reiss, Jr., and J.A. Roth, (eds.), *Understanding and Preventing Violence: Social Influences (Volume 3).* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Savoie, J. 2002. "Crime Statistics in Canada, 2001". *Juristat* 22(6): 1-22.

Sellers, C.S. 1999. "Self-Control and Intimate Violence: An Examination of the Scope and Specification of the General Theory of Crime." *Criminology* 37(2): 375-404.

Shaw, M. 1995. "Conceptualizing Violence by Women." In R.E. Dobash, R.P. Dobash and L. Noaks (eds.), *Gender and Crime.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Silverman, R.A. and L.W. Kennedy. 1987. "Relational Distance and Homicide: The Role of the Stranger." *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology* 78(2): 272-308.

Simon, R.J. 1975. *Women and Crime*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Smith, S.M., L.L. Martin and J.J. Kerwin. 2001. "Inhibition and Disinhibition of Male Aggressioin Against Females: A Personality Moderator Approach." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 31(1): 170-190.

Smith, W.R., and M. Torstensson. 1997. "Gender Differences In Risk Perception And Neutralizing Fear of Crime: Toward Resolving the Paradoxes." *British Journal of Criminology* 37(4): 608-634.

Sommers, I., and D.R. Baskin. 1993. "The Situational Context of Violent Female Offending." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30(2): 136-162.

Steffensmeier, D., and E. Allan. 1996. "Gender and Crime: Toward a Gendered Theory of Female Offending." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 459-87.

Steinke, P. 1991. "Using Situational Factors to Predict Types of Prison Violence." *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 17(1/2): 19-132.

Tedeschi, J.T., and R.B. Felson. 1994. *Violence, Aggression, and Coercive Actions.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Toch, H. 1986. "True to You, Darling, in My Fashion: The Notion of Contingent Consistency". In A. Campbell and J.J. Gibbs (eds.), *Violent Transactions: The Limits of Personality*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Tremblay, S. 2000. "Crime Statistics In Canada, 1999." *Juristat* 20(5): 1-24.

Vernberg, E.M., A.K. Jacobs, and S.L. Hershberger. 1999. "Peer Victimization and Attitudes About Violence During Early Adolescence." *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology* 28(3): 386-395.

Vogt, W. P. 1999. *Dictionary of Statistics and Methodology: A Nontechnical Guide for the Social Sciences*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Weinrath, M. and J. Gartrell. 1996. "Victimization and Fear of Crime." *Violence and Victims* 11(3): 187196.

West, C., and D.H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1(2): 125-151.

———, and S. Fenstermaker. 1995. "Doing Difference." *Gender & Society* 9(1): 8-37.

Wilkinson, D.L. and J. Fagan. 1996. "The Role of Firearms in Violence "Scripts": The Dynamics of Gun Events Among Adolescent Males." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 59(1): 55-89.

Wilson, J. Q., and R. J. Herrnstein. 1985. *Crime and Human Nature*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Wright, R.E. 1995. "Logistic Regression". In L.G. Grimm and P.R. Yarnold (eds.), *Reading and Understanding Multivariate Statistics*. Washington: American Psychological Association.

APPENDIX A

Interview instrument

ALBERTA/MANITOBA CONFLICT PROJECT SURVEY, 1994

INTERVIEWER NAME ______________________________

START TIME (24 hr.clock) ____|____|____|____

FIRST OF ALL, COULD YOU GIVE ME SOME INFORMATION ABOUT THIS HOUSEHOLD?

1. How long have you lived in this residence?

   ___ ___ years or ___ ___ months

2. Including yourself, how many persons altogether live here, related to you or related to you or not?

   Adults __________ (18+)

   Children _________ (Under 18)

   TOTAL _________

3. Now a list of the members of this household. To make it easier, I'm going to ask for the first name of each member. (START WITH RESPONDENT ON LINE 1)

RELATIONSHIP TO RESPONDENT	01	RSPDNT	02	SPOUSE
	03	SON	04	DAUGHTER
	05	MOTHER	06	FATHER
	07	SIBLING	08	RELATIVE
	09	FRIEND	10	OTHER
			99	NA
			00	NR

FIRST NAME	SEX 1 MALE 2 FEMALE	AGE	RELATIONSHIP
(1)			
(2)			
(3)			
(4)			
(5)			

4. In what type of building do you live (e.g. house, apartment, townhouse)?

Single house (incl. basement suite)............1
Duplex - side-by-side..............................2
Duplex - one above the other.....................3
Row/town house 4
Apartment less than 5 stories (incl. 4 plex)....5
Apartment with 5 or more stories................6
House attached to a non-residential structure..7
Mobile home..8

5. What is your current living arrangement? (READ RESPONSES, CODE LOWEST NUMBER)

Now married and living with spouse..............1
Common-law relationship or live-in partner....2
Single - never married..............................3
Divorced..4
Separated..5
Widowed..6

NOW SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT CRIME AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

6. Compared to TWO years ago, would you say that crime in your NEIGHBORHOOD has:

Increased 3
Remained the same, OR 2
Decreased 1
DK 8

7. How safe do you feel or would you feel walking alone in your neighborhood after dark? Would you feel:

Very safe 1
Reasonably safe 2
Somewhat unsafe, OR 3
Very unsafe 4
DK 8

8. In general, would you say that the sentences handed down by the Canadian criminal courts are:

Too severe	3
About right, OR	2
Not severe enough	1
DK	8

9. Alberta (Manitoba) has several programs where crime victims may meet with the person who committed the crime, in the presence of a trained mediator, to let this person know how the crime affected them and to work out a plan for repayment of losses.

   a. Suppose you were the victim of a non-violent property crime committed by a young adult (18 to 26). How likely would you be to participate in a program like this? Would you say:

Very likely	4
Likely	3
Unlikely, OR	2
Very unlikely	1
DK	8

   b. Now suppose you were the victim of a non-violent property crime committed by a juvenile (17 years or less). How likely would you be to participate in a mediation program? Would you say:

Very likely	4
Likely	3
Unlikely, OR	2
Very unlikely	1
DK	8

10. Next suppose that you are away, your home is burglarized and $1100 worth of property is stolen. The burglar has one previous conviction for a similar offense. In addition to a sentence of 3 years on probation, which would you prefer:

Repayment of $1100 to YOU, **OR**............1
4 months in jail for the burglar..................2
Both (volunteered and insistent)........3
DK..8

11. For the greatest impact on reducing crime, should additional money be spent on:

More prisons **OR**..............................1
Education, job training
and community programs.......................2
Both (volunteered and insistent)........3
DK..8

12. For the next questions, please answer yes or no.

Suppose you are witness to an incident where one man punches an adult male stranger. Would you approve if the adult stranger:

a. ... was in a protest march showing opposition to the other man's views?

Yes 1
No 2
DK 8

b. ... (Would you approve if the adult stranger) was drunk and bumped into the man and his wife on the street?

Yes 1
No 2
DK 8

c. ... (Would you approve if the adult stranger) had hit the man's child after the child accidentally damaged the stranger's car?

Yes 1
No 2
DK 8

d. ... (Would you approve if the adult stranger) was beating up on a woman and the man saw it?

Yes 1
No 2
DK 8

e. ... (Would you approve if the adult stranger) had broken into the man's house?

Yes 1
No 2
DK 8

Next would you approve of a police officer striking an adult male citizen:

f. ... if the male citizen had said vulgar and obscene things to the police officer?

Yes 1
No 2
DK 8

g. ... if the male citizen was being questioned as a suspect in a murder case?

Yes 1
No 2
DK 8

(Would you approve of a police officer striking an adult male citizen:)

h. ... if the male citizen was attempting to escape from custody?

Yes 1
No 2
DK 8

i. ... if the male citizen was attacking the police officer with his fists?

Yes 1
No 2
DK 8

13. For the next questions, please answer strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree.

a. I often act on impulse (spur of the moment) without stopping to think. (Optional read)

Strongly agree 1
Somewhat agree 2
Somewhat disagree, OR..3
Strongly disagree 4
DK 8

b. I often devote much thought and effort to preparing for the future. (Optional read)

STRONGLY AGREE			STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK
1	2	3	4	8

c. I often do whatever brings me pleasure here and now, even at the cost of some distant goal. (Optional read)

STRONGLY STRONGLY
AGREE DISAGREE DK
1 2 3 4 8

d. I'm more concerned with what happens to me in the short run than in the long run. (Optional read)

STRONGLY STRONGLY
AGREE DISAGREE DK
1 2 3 4 8

e. I frequently try to avoid projects that I know will be difficult. (Optional read)

STRONGLY STRONGLY
AGREE DISAGREE DK
1 2 3 4 8

f. When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw. (Optional read)

STRONGLY STRONGLY
AGREE DISAGREE DK
1 2 3 4 8

g. The things in life that are easiest to do bring me the most pleasure. (Optional read)

STRONGLY STRONGLY
AGREE DISAGREE DK
1 2 3 4 8

h. I dislike really hard tasks that stretch my abilities to the limit. (Optional read)

STRONGLY STRONGLY
AGREE DISAGREE DK
1 2 3 4 8

i. I almost always feel better when I am on the move than when I am sitting and thinking. (Optional read)

STRONGLY AGREE			STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK
1	2	3	4	8

j. I would rather go out and do things than sit at home and read. (Optional read)

STRONGLY AGREE			STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK
1	2	3	4	8

k. I seem to have more energy and a greater need for physical activities than most people my age. (Optional read)

STRONGLY AGREE			STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK
1	2	3	4	8

l. I try to look out for myself first (even if it means making things difficult for other people). (Optional read)

.STRONGLY AGREE			STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK
1	2	3	4	8

NEXT A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT THE POLICE

14. During the past 12 months, did you come into contact with the police ...

		Yes	No
a.	for a public information session such as Neighborhood Watch?	1	2
b.	for a traffic violation?	1	2
c.	as a victim of a crime?	1	2
d.	as a witness to a crime?	1	2
e.	for committing a crime?	1	2

(specify crime below)

____

15. Have you EVER been arrested?

Yes 1
No . . . . . . 2 (GO TO 16)

What was the reason?

(specify; last time if more than once)

____

16. In the past TWO YEARS, have you done any of the following things to protect yourself or your property from crime? Have you ....

		Yes	No
a.	changed your routine, activities, or avoided certain places?	1	2
b.	installed new locks?	1	2
c.	installed burglar alarms?	1	2
d.	taken a self defense course?	1	2
e.	changed your phone number?	1	2
f.	obtained a dog?	1	2
g.	obtained a gun?	1	2

NEXT SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT SOCIAL CONFLICTS

Everyone gets into conflicts with other people once in a while. Some disputes are very serious and some are not. I am going to ask you about some conflicts that you may have had with other adults (over 18) in the last 12 months.

17. First, (in the last 12 months), were you involved in a crime attack? (actual robbery, or assault)

Yes 1
No . . . . . . 2 (GO TO 18)

a. Who was involved?

18. ... (in the last 12 months) were you involved in a situation where a crime attack (robbery, assault) was threatened but not carried out?

Yes 1
No . . . . . . 2 (GO TO 19)

a. Who was involved?

19. ... (in the last 12 months) were you involved in an argument over money?

Yes 1
No . . . . . . 2 (GO TO 20)

a. Who was involved?

20. ... (in the last 12 months) were you involved in an argument with a landlord?

Yes 1
No . . . . . . 2 (GO TO 21)

a. Who was involved?

21. ... (in the last 12 months) were you involved in an argument with a neighbor?

Yes 1
No . . . . . . 2 (GO TO 22)

a. Who was involved?

22. ... (in the last 12 months) were you involved in a conflict in the family?

Yes 1
No . . . . . . 2 (GO TO 23)

a. What was this person's relationship to you?

23. ... (in the last 12 months) were you involved in any other conflict?

Yes 1
No . . . . . . 2 (GO TO 24)

a. Who was involved?

Now, a quick review of the conflicts. You've indicated you were involved in (NAME THE TYPES OF CONFLICT) in the past year.

24. (Interviewer: Check if yes)

	Yes	
a crime attack	____	
a crime threat	____	
an argument over money	____	
an argument with a landlord	____	(IF R ANSWERED 1 TYPE, GO TO 27)
an argument with a neighbor	____	
a conflict in the family	____	
another conflict	____	
No conflicts (NONE of the above)	____	(IF NONE, GO TO 47)

25. Which ONE of these (above) was the most serious conflict:

crime attack	1
crime threat	2
argument over money	3
argument with landlord	4
argument with neighbor	5
conflict in the family	6
other conflict	7
DK	8

26. Briefly, would you describe what happened and why it was the most serious conflict?

27. I would like to ask you a few questions about the ___________: (NAME MOST SERIOUS TYPE OF CONFLICT).

Where did this incident take place? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

a. at home ____
b. at work ____
c. at school ____
d. On sidewalk/street/highway ____
e. In a restaurant or bar ____
f. In a park or recreation area ____
g. Elsewhere ____
(specify) ____________________

28. Thinking back to the circumstances of the dispute, who started the conflict?

you (self)........................1
the other person, OR............2
a third-party (someone else)...3

29. How many people were involved not including yourself?

___ ___ (Number) (If more than one person, GO TO 32)

DK . . 98

30. How well did you know this person? Would you say:

Well known 1
Casual acquaintance ....2 (GO TO 34)
Known by sight only, OR . . 3 (GO TO 34)
You did not know him/her . . 4 (GO TO 34)

31. What was the person's relationship to you?

Spouse . . . . 1 (GO TO 34)
Ex-spouse . . . . 2 (GO TO 34)
Other relative . . . . 3 (GO TO 34)
Friend . . . . 4 (GO TO 34)
Neighbor . . . . 5 (GO TO 34)
Other . . . . 6 (GO TO 34)

(specify) ____________________________

32. Did you know any of these people?

Yes 1
No 2 (GO TO 34)
DK 8 (GO TO 34)

33. What was their relationship to you? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

Spouse ____

Ex-spouse ____

Other relative(s) ____

Friend(s) ____

Neighbor(s) ____

Other . . . . . ____

(specify) ____________________________

34. Was this the first and only time this incident happened; or did it happen more often?

only time. 1
two times. 2
three or more times. . . 3
DK. 8

35. Was there any violence in the dispute?

Yes 1
No . . . . 2 (GO TO 37)

36. Would you briefly describe what violence happened?

37. Was the dispute resolved (ended)?

Yes 1
No . . . . 2 (GO TO 39)

38. Briefly, what helped to resolve the conflict?

____

____(GO TO 40)

39. Has this dispute escalated (got worse) over time?

No 2 (GO TO 40)
Yes 1

If yes, in what ways has the dispute escalated?

____

40. Sometimes other parties intervene in conflicts. For example, friends, neighbors, police, lawyers, or others.

a. Did anyone else intervene in your conflict?

Yes 1
No 2 (GO TO 41)

b. Who was principally involved in intervening in your conflict? (CIRCLE ONE)

friend 01
neighbor 02
stranger 03
police 04
lawyer 05
social worker 06
insurance company. . . 07
family member. 08
other. 09

(specify) ______________________

c. Did they (PERSON ABOVE) make things better, worse or did things stay the same?

Better 1
Worse, OR 2
Same 3
DK 8

41. Did you call the police?

Yes 1
No 2

42. Did the police come?

Yes 1
No 2

43. Do you think that a crime occurred?

Yes 1
No 2

44. Did the police make an arrest?

Yes 1
No 2 (GO TO 46)

45. Do you think that the arrest stopped the conflict from continuing?

Yes 1
No 2

46. Overall, on a 7-point scale from 1=not at all serious to 7=extremely serious, how serious would you say this conflict was/is?

Not at all serious Extremely Serious DK
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

47. What is the most serious thing that has ever happened to you that could be considered a crime?

(Interviewer: ONE response only. Do not read.)

Your approximate age when this happened?

Sexual assault (*rape, attempted rape, molesting, attempted molesting*) .... 01 __ __

Robbery / Attempt (*face-to-face threat or assault with a weapon and theft of property. If there was no weapon, no attack or any threat of attack classify elsewhere.*) .... 02 __ __

Assault (*face-to-face threat or assault with a weapon but no theft of property or attempt*) .... 03 __ __

Break and Enter / Attempt (*illegal entry or attempt into your residence or any other building on your property*) ....04 __ __

Motor vehicle theft / attempt (*theft or attempted theft of motor vehicle or part*) ....05 __ __

Theft of personal property / attempt (*money or other personal property was taken or attempted to be taken*) ....06 __ __

Theft of household property / attempt ....07 __ __

Vandalism (*something was damaged*) ....08 __ __

Other .... 87 __ __
(*Specify*)

Not applicable / never a victim of crime ... 99

NEXT, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT SOME TYPES OF CONFLICTS. I WILL DESCRIBE A BRIEF SCENARIO AND THEN I WILL ASK YOU TO CONSIDER WHAT YOU WOULD DO IN THE SITUATION.

(See Appendix B for the Scenarios)

NOW WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR LIFESTYLE

48. People participate in a variety of evening activities outside their home. On average, how many times a month do you go out during the evening to do the following activities?

		No. of times a month
a.	Work nights, attend night classes, go to meetings or do volunteer work	___ ___
b.	Go to restaurants, movies or the theater?	___ ___
c.	Go to bars or pubs?	___ ___
d.	Go out for sports, exercise or recreational activities?	___ ___
e.	Shop in the evening?	___ ___
f.	Go out to bingo?	___ ___
g.	Go out to a casino, or to play VLTs (Video lottery terminals)?	___ ___
h.	Visit relatives or friends in their own homes?	___ ___
i.	Other evening activities not already mentioned?	___ ___

THE NEXT QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT SMOKING

49. At the present time do you smoke cigarettes daily, occasionally, or not at all?

Daily	1	
Occasionally	2	
Not at all	3	(GO TO 51)

50. About how many cigarettes do you smoke each day? ___ ___ ___

51. Do you smoke pipes, cigars, or cigarillos daily, occasionally, or not at all?

Daily	1
Occasionally	2
Not at all	3

NOW A QUESTION ABOUT DRINKING

52. In the past 12 months, how often, on average, did you drink any alcoholic beverages such as beer, wine, or liquor? (USE LIST TO PROBE IF NECESSARY)

Never	00
Every day	01
6 days a week	02
5-6 days a week	03
5 days a week	04
4-5 days a week	05
4 days a week	06
3-4 days a week	07
3 days a week	08
2-3 days a week	09
2 days a week	10
1-2 days a week	11
1 day a week (4 days/month)	12
3-4 days a month	13
3 days a month	14
2-3 days a month	15
2 days a month	16
1-2 days a month	17
once a month	18
less than once a month	19
DK	98

THE NEXT QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT TRAVELLING IN A CAR, TRUCK, OR OTHER MOTOR VEHICLE

53. At the present time do you wear a seatbelt every trip, occasionally, or not at all?

Every trip 1
Occasionally. . .2
Not at all 3

54. In the last 12 months have you driven a car, truck, or other motor vehicle?

Yes 1
No 2 (GO TO 56)

55. How often would you say that you would exceed the speed limit by 20km/hr whenever you could get away with it? Would you say:

Always 1
Occasionally, OR 2
Never 3
DK 8

THE NEXT QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT RISK TAKING

56. For these questions, please answer strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree.

a. I like to test myself every now and then by doing something a little risky. (Optional read)

Strongly agree 1
Somewhat agree 2
Somewhat disagree, OR . . . 3
Strongly disagree 4
DK 8

b. Sometimes I will take a risk just for the fun of it. (Optional read)

STRONGLY STRONGLY
AGREE DISAGREE DK
1 2 3 4 8

c. Excitement and adventure are more important to me than security. (Optional read)

STRONGLY STRONGLY
AGREE DISAGREE DK
1 2 3 4 8

d. If I had a choice, I would always do something physical rather than something mental. (Optional read)

STRONGLY STRONGLY
AGREE DISAGREE DK
1 2 3 4 8

e. I'm not very sympathetic to other people even when they are having problems. (Optional read)

STRONGLY STRONGLY
AGREE DISAGREE DK
1 2 3 4 8

f. If things I do upset people, it's their problem not mine. (Optional read)

STRONGLY STRONGLY
AGREE DISAGREE DK
1 2 3 4 8

g. I will try to get the things I want even when I know it's causing problems for other people. (Optional read)

STRONGLY STRONGLY
AGREE DISAGREE DK
1 2 3 4 8

h. I lose my temper pretty easily. (Optional read)

STRONGLY AGREE			STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK
1	2	3	4	8

i. Often, when I'm angry at people I feel more like hurting them than talking to them about why I am angry. (Optional read)

STRONGLY AGREE			STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK
1	2	3	4	8

j. When I'm really angry, other people better stay away from me. (Optional read)

STRONGLY AGREE			STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK
1	2	3	4	8

k. When I have a serious disagreement with someone, it's usually hard for me to talk calmly about it without getting upset. (Optional read)

STRONGLY AGREE			STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK
1	2	3	4	8

NOW SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT SOCIAL CONTACTS

57. Of your relatives, excluding those who live in your household, how many do you see at least once a month?

DK 998

58. Of your friends, excluding any who may live in your household, how many do you see at least once a month?

DK 998

59. Who would you turn to FIRST, (not including your spouse or children at home,) if:

a. ... you needed help for work in your home or garden?

Father 1
Mother 2
Friend 3
Neighbor 4
Other 5
(specify) ____
DK 8

b. ... had to borrow a large sum ($500) of money?

Father 1
Mother 2
Friend 3
Neighbor 4
Bank 5
Other 6
(specify) ____
DK 8

c. ... you were depressed?

Father 1
Mother 2
Friend 3
Neighbor 4
Physician 5
Other 6
(specify) ____
DK 8

d. ... you had to make an important personal decision and needed advice?

Father 1
Mother 2
Friend 3
Neighbor 4
Bank 5
Other 6
(specify) ______________________________
DK 8

THESE FINAL QUESTIONS WILL GIVE US A BETTER PICTURE OF THE PEOPLE WHO TOOK PART IN THE STUDY

60. In 1993, how many months were you employed full-time? Part-time?

a. Months FULL-TIME ___ ___

b. Months PART-TIME ___ ___

61. What is your current employment or work situation? For each of the following, please tell me if it applies to you. (HAVE RESPONDENT ANSWER EACH QUESTION.)

	YES	NO	NA
a. Employed full-time............	1	2	
b. Employed part-time............	1	2	

(ASK c if R is AGE 45+ and NOT employed full-time)

c. Retired (no job at all)........	1	2	9

(IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE GO TO 62; OTHERWISE CONTINUE)

d. Unemployed (out of work and looking for work)..............	1	2	9
e. Never in the labor force	1	2	9

62. People also do a variety of other types of work, even though it may not involve a paid job. For each of the following, please tell me if it applies to you.

(RECORD "SHARED" ONLY IF VOLUNTEERED)

	YES	NO	SHARED
a. Mainly responsible for housework......	1	2	3
b. Mainly responsible for raising a child or children.............................	1	2	3
c. Taking care of some other dependent person (elder, disabled, grandchild).....	1	2	3
d. Currently going to school or studying in some program....................	1	2	
e. Doing some volunteer work...............	1	2	

(IF NEVER IN THE LABOR FORCE, GO TO 66)

63. What kind of work do/did you normally do? That is, what is/was your job title?

64. What does/did that job involve? (Describe.)

65. What kind of business or organization (do/did) you work for? What (does/did) your employer do or make?

INDUSTRY ________________________________

(NOTE: ASK 66 IF R IS MARRIED/COMMON LAW; ALL OTHERS GO TO 71)

66. Please tell me which of the following work situations apply to your spouse/partner at the present time. Is he/she:

(HAVE RESPONDENT ANSWER EACH QUESTION.)

	YES	NO	NA
a. Employed full-time	1	2	
b. Employed part-time	1	2	

(ASK c if Spouse/partner is AGE 45+ and NOT employed full-time)

c. Retired (no job at all)	1	2	9

(IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE GO TO 67; OTHERWISE CONTINUE)

d. Unemployed (out of work and looking for work)	1	2	9
e. Never in the labor force	1	2	9

67. People also do a variety of other types of work, even though it may not involve a paid job. For each of the following, please tell me if it applies to your spouse/partner.

(RECORD **"SHARED"** ONLY IF VOLUNTEERED)

	YES	NO	SHARED
a. Mainly responsible for housework	1	2	3
b. Mainly responsible for raising a child or children	1	2	3
c. Taking care of some other dependent person (elder, disabled, grandchild)	1	2	3
d. Currently going to school or studying in some program	1	2	
e. Doing some volunteer work	1	2	

(NOTE: IF SPOUSE/PARTNER NEVER IN THE LABOUR FORCE, GO TO 71)

68. What kind of work does/did your spouse/partner normally do? That is, what is/was his/her job title?

____

69. What does/did that job involve? (Describe.)

____

70. What kind of place (does/did) he/she work for?

INDUSTRY ________________________________

NEXT, CONSIDERING EDUCATION ...

71. What is your highest level of education (this includes complete and incomplete)? (circle category below)

72. What is your spouse's/partner's highest level of education (this includes complete and incomplete)? (Circle category below)

	Respondent	Spouse/Partner
No Schooling	01	01
Elementary School		
Incomplete	02	02
Complete	03	03
Junior High School		
Incomplete	04	04
Complete	05	05
High School		
Incomplete	06	06
Complete (GED)	07	07
Non-University (Voc/Tech, Nursing Schools)		
Incomplete	08	08
Complete	09	09
University		
Incomplete	10	10
Diploma/Certificate (e.g. Hygienists)	11	11
Bachelor's Degree	12	12
Professional Degree (Vets, Drs., Dentists, Lawyers)	13	13
Master's Degree	14	14
Doctorate	15	15
NO SPOUSE	-- 99	
DK	-- 98	

73. Where were your parents born? Were they: (READ RESPONSES)

Both were born outside of Canada 1
One was born in Canada 2
Both were born in Canada 3
DK 8

74. How would you describe your ethnic identity? (Examples of ethnic or cultural groups would be: Ukrainian, German, Japanese, etc.)

____

75. To what ethnic group(s) did your father's side of the family belong?

____

DK 98

76. To what ethnic group(s) did your mother's side of the family belong?

____

DK 98

77. Would you say that you (and your family) are better off or worse off or just the same financially than you were a year ago?

Better now 1
Same 2
Worse 3
DK 8

78. Now looking ahead - do you think that a year from now you (and your family) will be better off or worse off or just about the same financially than you are now?

Will be better off.......1
Same 2
Will be worse off.......3
DK 8

79. What is the total income of all members of this household for this past year before taxes and deductions? (Circle the corresponding category number).

No income	00	36,000 - 37,999	17
Under $ 6,000	01	38,000 - 39,999	18
6,000 - 7,999	02	40,000 - 44,999	19
8,000 - 9,999	03	45,000 - 49,999	20
10,000 - 11,999	04	50,000 - 54,999	21
12,000 - 13,999	05	55,000 - 59,999	22
14,000 - 15,999	06	60,000 - 64,999	23
16,000 - 17,999	07	65,000 - 69,999	24
18,000 - 19,999	08	70,000 - 74,999	25
20,000 - 21,999	09	75,000 - 79,999	26
22,000 - 23,999	10	80,000 - 84,999	27
24,000 - 25,999	11	85,000 - 89,999	28
26,000 - 27,999	12	90,000 - 94,999	29
28,000 - 29,999	13	95,000 - 99,999	30
30,000 - 31,999	14	100,000+............	31
32,000 - 33,999	15	DK..................	98
34,000 - 35,999	16	NR	99

80. What is your own total individual income for this past year before taxes and deductions? (Circle the corresponding category number).

No income	00	36,000 - 37,999	17
Under $ 6,000	01	38,000 - 39,999	18
6,000 - 7,999	02	40,000 - 44,999	19
8,000 - 9,999	03	45,000 - 49,999	20
10,000 - 11,999	04	50,000 - 54,999	21
12,000 - 13,999	05	55,000 - 59,999	22
14,000 - 15,999	06	60,000 - 64,999	23
16,000 - 17,999	07	65,000 - 69,999	24
18,000 - 19,999	08	70,000 - 74,999	25
20,000 - 21,999	09	75,000 - 79,999	26
22,000 - 23,999	10	80,000 - 84,999	27
24,000 - 25,999	11	85,000 - 89,999	28
26,000 - 27,999	12	90,000 - 94,999	29
28,000 - 29,999	13	95,000 - 99,999	30
30,000 - 31,999	14	100,000+...........	31
32,000 - 33,999	15	DK..................	98
34,000 - 35,999	16	NR	99

34,000 - 35,999 .... 16 NR 99

81. Do you (or your spouse) presently own or rent your residence?

own 1
rent 2

82. a. If an election were held today, how would you vote federally?

Liberal 1
New Democratic Party 2
Progressive Conservative 3
Reform Party 4
Wouldn't Vote 5
Not Eligible 6
Other
(Specify) ______________________________ 7
DK 8

b. If an election were held today, how would you vote provincially?

Liberal 1
New Democrats 2
Progressive Conservative 3
Wouldn't Vote 4
Not Eligible 5
Other
(Specify) ______________________ 6
DK 8

83. We'd like to know whether we reach people from all areas in Alberta/Manitoba. Can you please tell me your postal code?

__ __ __/__ __ __

NR 000 000
DK 888 888

84. Finally, if we want to talk to you (or a member of your family) again with some follow-up questions, may we call you?

Yes 1
No 2

85. In the Spring we mail out a summary report of the study findings. Would you like a copy of the report? If so, may I have your complete name and mailing address?

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO DO THIS INTERVIEW

86. Finish Time (24 hour clock) ____|____|____|____

THIS PAGE TO BE COMPLETED BY THE INTERVIEWER

87. Quality of interview:
High quality 1
Adequate 2
Questionable 3

88. Respondent's cooperation:
Cooperative 1
Indifferent 2
Uncooperative 3

89. Did you ask spouse/partner or others for privacy?
Yes ....1 (CONTINUE)
No ....2 (GO TO 90)
NA ....9 (GO TO 90)

IF YES, did the person(s) comply?
Yes 1
No 2

90. Sources of interview interference, if any? (COMPLETE FOR ALL CATEGORIES)

	Yes	No
Alcohol	1	2
Language	1	2
Age	1	2
Illness	1	2
Noise	1	2
Presence of spouse	1	2
Presence of children	1	2
Presence of others	1	2
Phone calls (call waiting)..	1	2
Other	1	2

91. Anything about the respondent or the interview situation that seems important?

I declare that this interview was conducted in accordance with the interviewing and sampling instructions given by the Population Research Laboratory, Alberta / Winnipeg Area Study, Winnipeg. I agree that the content of all the respondent's responses will be kept confidential.

____

(Interviewer's Signature)

APPENDIX B

Scenarios

The Work Domain

1. Suppose (you/you and a friend) are walking across a field at a public school in late afternoon. The school yard is (practically empty/very crowded). A (male/female) (lower class/middle class/wealthy)-looking (youth/35-year old/elderly person) [tells (you/you and a friend)/yells insulting comments at (you/you and a friend)/pushes at (you/you and a friend)] to get you off the field.

2. Next, let's say (you were working alone/you were at work with several co-workers). A stranger comes into the office to register a complaint. The stranger is a (lower class/middle class/wealthy)-looking (18-year-old/35-year-old/elderly) (male/female). (He/she) walks in and (loudly tells/yells insulting comments at/pushes) (you/your co-worker), saying the product is defective.

3. Next, suppose (you/you and a friend) are waiting at a counter for a clerk to help you with a purchase and the store is (practically empty/very crowded). A (lower class/middle class/wealthy)-looking (18-year-old/35-year-old/elderly) (man/woman) [cuts in/yells at (you/you and a friend) to cut in/pushes (you/you and a friend) to cut in] front, saying (he/she) is late for an appointment.

The Street Domain

4. Next, suppose (you/you and a friend) are passing by a local convenience store on an afternoon walk. The street is (practically empty/very crowded). Suddenly, a person (yells out loudly/yells out insulting comments/steps out and pushes) at (you/you and a friend). This person is a (lower class/middle class/wealthy)-looking (18-year-old/35-year-old/elderly) (man/woman).

5. Now, suppose (you/you and a friend) are on your way home from a restaurant. You are walking and the street is (practically empty/very crowded). Suddenly, a (lower class/middle class/wealthy)-looking (18-year-old/35-year-old/elderly) (man/woman) steps in front of (you/your friend). (He/she) [tells (you/your friend/yells insulting comments and tells (you/your friend)/pushes and tells (you/your friend)] to hand over your money.

6. Next, suppose (you/you and a friend) are out for a drive in a car and the street is (practically empty/very crowded). Suddenly, while stopped for a light, the car behind you fails to stop and strikes your car giving you a jolt. The other driver is a (lower class/middle class/wealthy)-looking (18-year-old/35-year-old/elderly) (man/woman). After looking at the damage, the other driver [calls (you/you and a friend)/yells insulting comments saying (you are/your friend is)/pushes and calls (you are/your friend is)] a menace to traffic for stopping abruptly.

The Domestic Domain

7. Now, let's say you've gone (alone/with your spouse or a friend) out to dinner at a friend's home. They are having a (small/very large dinner party. One couple, whom you've never met before is having a fight. A (lower class/middle class/wealthy)-looking (18-year-old/35-year-old/elderly) (man/woman) is (yelling at/yelling at and insulting/pushing) (his/her) spouse or partner.

8. Now, suppose you've gone (alone/with friends) to a school play. It is a (small/very large) affair. As the play is about to start a child has become separated from his/her guardian and the child accidentally bumps into (you/your friend). The child's supervisor at the play is a (lower class/middle class/wealthy)-looking (18-year-old/35-year-old/elderly) (man/woman). This person comes over and (yells at/yells insulting comments at/hits) the child.

9. Now, let's say you're (alone/with friends) at home and your neighbor is having a (small/very large) party. Suppose your neighbor is a (lower class/middle class/wealthy)-looking (18-year-old/35-year-old/elderly) (man/woman). If it was late evening and the noise from the party was (loud/getting worse/getting worse inside and outside the home).

The Leisure Domain

10. Next, suppose you are (alone/with friends) at a sporting event and you are sitting in seats that a stranger comes up and claims without showing a ticket. The seats around you are (practically empty/very crowded). The stranger (tells/yells insulting names/pushes) (you/your friend) to leave. The other person is a (lower class/middle class/wealthy)-looking (18-year-old/35-year-old/elderly) (man/woman).

11. Next, let's say you have gone out (alone/with friends) to a neighborhood pub or bar and you are using a Video Lottery Terminal. The bar is (practically empty/very crowded). A stranger comes over and wants to use the machine. Without waiting (his/her) turn they (tell/yell insulting names/yell insulting names and pushes) (you/your friend) to leave. The stranger is a (lower class/middle class/wealthy)-looking (18-year-old/35-year-old/elderly) (man/woman).

12. Finally, suppose (you/you and a friend) are on vacation out of town taking a late-night walk. The street is (practically empty/very crowded). Suddenly, a person steps in front of you bumping into (you/your friend). This person is a (lower class/middle class/wealthy)-looking (18-year-old/35-year-old/elderly) (man/woman). After looking at (you/your friend), (he/she) [calls (you/your friend)/yells insulting names at (you/your friend) and calls (you/your friend)/pushes and calls (you/your friend)] a lousy tourist and says to get off the street and go back to your hotel.

APPENDIX C

Trials Broken Down by Scenario

Table C.1: Trial One (S1Type)

Scenario	f	%
Schoolyard	499	24.3
Worker	512	25.0
Customer	583	28.4
Sporting Event	171	8.3
Pub	144	7.0
Vacation	143	7.0
Total	2052	100.0

Table C.2: Trial Two (S2Type)

Scenario	f	%
Schoolyard	17	.8
Worker	8	.4
Customer	6	.3
Convenience	488	23.8
Robbery	513	25.0
Traffic Accident	594	29.0
Spousal	140	6.8
Child	123	6.0
Neighbor	162	7.9
Total	2052	100.0

Table C.3: Trial Three (S3Type)

Scenario	f	%
Convenience	176	8.6
Robbery	156	7.6
Traffic Accident	124	6.1
Spousal	530	25.8
Child	569	27.7
Neighbor	497	24.2
Total	2052	100.0

Table C.4: Trial Four (S4Type)

Scenario	f	%
Schoolyard	155	7.6
Worker	155	7.6
Customer	115	5.6
Spousal	12	.6
Child	6	.3
Neighbor	13	.6
Sporting Event	506	24.6
Pub	542	26.4
Vacation	549	26.8
Total	2052	100.0

APPENDIX D

Table D.1: Selected Pooled Regression Findings from Kennedy and Forde (1999)

	Aggression	
Independent Variables	b	R
Upset	.24**	.13
Intensity	.61**	.14
Alone	-.11	.00
Gender of Harm Doer	.30**	.04
Age of Harm Doer	.03	.02
Gender of Respondent	.89**	.13
Age of Respondent	-.01	-.01
Same Gender (Respondent and Harm Doer)	.49**	.07

*p<.05 **p<.01

Table D.2: Upset, Claiming and Aggression by Scenario

Scenario	Upset (Scale 0-10)	%Claim	%Aggression
Schoolyard	5.3	52	10
Worker	4.9	40	6
Customer	4.5	48	3
Convenience Store	4.8	56	17
Robbery	7.8	77	55
Traffic Accident	6.9	87	4
Spousal	5.8	54	21
Child	7.5	86	23
Neighbor	5	57	1
Sporting Event	5.9	87	14
Pub	6	82	10
Vacation	5.8	54	5

APPENDIX E

Two Forms of the Dependent Variable

The following tables represent a comparison of the final results for each Trial and for each form of the dependent variable. Dependent Variable One includes those individuals who responded 'no' to *Claiming*, while Dependent Variable Two does not. The tables reveal minimal differences in the results. The first form of the dependent variable is used in all of the analyses in the current study.

Trial One

Table E.1: Dependent Variable One

Variable	B	Exp(B)
Gender of Respondent	-.058	.944
Age of Respondent	.005	1.005
Low Self-Control	.676*	1.965
Attitudes Towards Violence	.283***	1.327
Upset	.263***	1.300
Intensity	.621***	1.862
Respondent Alone	.-182	.833
Age of Harm Doer	-.476**	.621
Gender of Harm Doer	.058	1.060
Gender * Gender	1.517*	4.559
Age * Upset	-.011***	.990

N = 1558 ***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<.05

Table E.2: Dependent Variable Two

Variable	B	Exp(B)
Gender of Respondent	-.199	.819
Age of Respondent	.012	1.012
Low Self-Control	.495	1.641
Attitudes Towards Violence	.231**	1.260
Upset	.170**	1.186
Intensity	.546**	1.727
Respondent Alone	-.164	849
Age of Harm Doer	-.471**	.625
Gender of Harm Doer	.095	1.100
Gender * Gender	1.467*	4.337
Age * Upset	-.013***	.987

N = 822 ***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<.05

Trial Two

Table E.3: Dependent Variable One

Variable	B	Exp(B)
Gender of Respondent	.333	1.395
Age of Respondent	.003	1.003
Low Self-control	-.038	.963
Attitudes Towards Violence	.124**	1.132
Upset	.250***	1.284
Intensity	.386***	1.471
Respondent Alone	-.094	.910
Age of Harm Doer	.189*	1.208
Gender of Harm Doer	-.568**	.567
Gender * Gender	.839**	2.315
Age * Upset	-.001	.999

N = 1552 ***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<.05

Table E.4: Dependent Variable Two

Variable	B	Exp(B)
Gender of Respondent	.168	1.182
Age of Respondent	.003	1.003
Low Self-Control	-.083	.920
Attitudes Towards Violence	.130**	1.138
Upset	.202***	1.224
Intensity	.332***	1.393
Respondent Alone	.037	1.038
Age of Harm Doer	.191*	1.210
Gender of Harm Doer	-.618**	.539
Gender * Gender	.959**	2.610
Age * Upset	-.001	.999

N = 1111 ***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<.05

Trial Three

Table E.5: Dependent Variable One

Variable	B	Exp(B)
Gender of Respondent	.458	1.581
Age of Respondent	-.007	.993
Low Self-Control	.085	1.088
Attitudes Towards Violence	.093	1.098
Upset	.368***	1.445
Intensity	.868***	2.381
Respondent Alone	-.227	.797
Age of Harm Doer	-.064	.938
Gender of Harm Doer	.151	1.163
Gender * Gender	.830*	2.293
Age * Upset	-.002	.998

N = 1552 ***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<.05

Table E.6: Dependent Variable Two

Variable	B	Exp(B)
Gender of Respondent	.427	1.532
Age of Respondent	-.006	.994
Low Self-Control	.077	1.080
Attitudes Towards Violence	.077	1.080
Upset	.312***	1.366
Intensity	.890***	2.435
Respondent Alone	-.207	.813
Age of Harm Doer	-.044	.957
Gender of Harm Doer	.141	1.151
Gender * Gender	.768*	2.155
Age * Upset	-.002	.998

N = 1061***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<.05

Trial Four

Table E.7: Dependent Variable One

Variable	B	Exp(B)
Gender of Respondent	.389	1.475
Age of Respondent	.012	1.012
Low Self-control	.937**	2.553
Attitudes Towards Violence	.107	1.113
Upset	.236***	1.267
Intensity	.224	1.251
Respondent Alone	-.612*	.542
Age of Harm Doer	-.074	.928
Gender of Harm Doer	.077	1.080
Gender * Gender	1.030*	2.800
Age * Upset	-.008**	.992

N = 1555 ***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<.05

Table E.8: Dependent Variable Two

Variable	B	Exp(B)
Gender of Respondent	.351	1.421
Age of Respondent	.016*	1.016
Low Self-control	.928**	2.530
Attitudes Towards Violence	.075	1.077
Upset	.178***	1.195
Intensity	.245	1.277
Respondent Alone	-.488	.614
Age of Harm Doer	-.074	.928
Gender of Harm Doer	.052	1.054
Gender * Gender	1.008*	2.739
Age * Upset	-.009**	.991

N = 1077 ***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<.05

APPENDIX F

Self-control Questions and Scales

Original Scale of Self-control from Grasmick et. al. (1993)

The following scale of self-control was developed by Harold G. Grasmick, Charles R. Tittle, Robert J. Bursik, Jr., and Bruce J. Arneklev (1993). Subjects were asked to respond to each of the 24 items listed below using the responses (4) strongly agree, (3) agree somewhat, (2) disagree somewhat, or (1) strongly disagree. This means that a high score on the scale indicates a low level of self-control.

Impulsivity

- I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think.
- I don't devote much thought and effort to preparing for the future.
- I often do whatever brings me pleasure here and now, even at the cost of some distant goal.
- I'm more concerned with what happens to me in the short run than in the long run.

Simple Tasks

- I frequently try to avoid projects that I know will be difficult.
- When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw.
- The things in life that are easiest to do bring me the most pleasure.
- I dislike really hard tasks that stretch my abilities to the limit.

Risk Seeking

- I like to test myself every now and then by doing something a little risky.
- Sometimes I will take a risk just for the fun of it.
- I sometimes find it exciting to do things for which I might get in trouble
- Excitement and adventure are more important to me than security.

Physical Activities

- If I had a choice, I would almost always rather do something physical than something mental.
- I almost always feel better when I am on the move than when I am sitting and thinking.
- I like to get out and do things more than I like to read or contemplate ideas.
- I seem to have more energy and a greater need for activity than most other people my age.

Self-centered

- I try to look out for myself first, even if it means making things difficult for other people.
- I'm not very sympathetic to other people when they are having problems.
- If things I do upset people, it's their problem not mine.
- I will try to get the things I want even when I know its causing problems for other people.

Temper

- I lose my temper pretty easily.
- Often, when I'm angry at people I feel more like hurting them than talking to them about why I am angry.
- When I'm really angry, other people better stay away from me.
- When I have a serious disagreement with someone, its usually hard for me to talk calmly about it without getting upset.

Modifications made by Kennedy and Forde (1999)

First, Forde and Kennedy (1997) removed Grasmick et al.'s (1993) third indicator of risk seeking worded "*I sometimes find it exciting to do things for which I might get in to trouble*", because the authors felt that this statement confuses risk-seeking with trouble. As a result of removing this item, Forde and Kennedy (1997) were left with a 23-item scale of self-control.

In addition to the removal of one item, Forde and Kennedy (1997) also made some changes to the wording of various items as well as the order of the questions in the survey. First, the first question in relation to *Impulsivity* was altered to read "act on impulse", with "spur of the moment" only read when the respondent requested further explanation of the statement (Forde and Kennedy 1997: 273). Second, the wording of the second question in relation to *Impulsivity* was altered to make the question positive as opposed to negative, for the purposes of increasing the variety of the questions. Third, at the advice of Grasmick et al. (1993), the word "physical" was placed in front of the work "activities" (see the items discussed above). Finally, Forde and Kennedy (1997) altered the administration of the self-control scale by first presenting the questions in two separate sections of the survey, and second, by reversing the positioning of a few of the questions as compared to the presentation of the original survey.

The Scale Used in the Current Study

For the purposes of constructing a scale of self-control for the current study, a reliability analysis was conducted with the 23 items used by Forde and Kennedy (1997) as adapted from the Grasmick et al. (1993) scale. The initial reliability analysis of all 23 items produced an alpha of .7384 and suggested the removal of the item "*I often devote much thought and effort to preparing for the future*". Given that this is the item modified by Forde and Kennedy (1997) to be positive rather than negative, it is not surprising that the analysis indicated that the scale would be stronger without it. As a result this variable was removed and a second reliability analysis was conducted for the remaining 22 items.

The second reliability analysis with the above item removed resulted in a slightly stronger alpha of .7531 and further suggested that if the item "*I seem to have more energy and a greater need for physical activities than most people my age*" were removed, the scale would be improved. In the original tests of the general theory conducted by Grasmick et al. (1993) and Arneklev et al. (1993) reliability analyses of the 24 items also suggested that this item should be removed. As a result of this, Arneklev et al. (1993) deleted the variable and worked with a 23 item linear composite of self-control. As a consequence of this second reliability analysis and the supporting research by Grasmick et al. (1993) and Arneklev et al. (1993) it was decided that this item would be removed.

Finally, a third reliability analysis was conducted with the remaining 21 items. The last analysis produced an alpha of .7559, only slightly better than the previous analyses; nevertheless, it was decided that the final scale would include the remaining 21 variables from which the scale of self-control could be constructed. Importantly, in their initial examination of the 24 item scale Grasmick et al. (1993) report a Cronbach alpha of .805. Similarly, a much later study by Sellers (1999) reports an alpha of .83 from a reliability analysis of all 24 items in the original Grasmick et al. (1993) scale. Consequently, while the strength of the scale used in the current study with only 21 items is slightly weaker than scales in past studies, the difference is by no means alarming.

Respondents were presented with the statements listed below and asked to respond as follows: strongly agree (4), somewhat agree (3), somewhat disagree (2), or strongly disagree (1).

- I often act on impulse (spur of the moment) without stopping to think.
- I often do whatever brings me pleasure here and now, even at the cost of some distant goal.
- I'm more concerned with what happens to me in the short run than in the long run.

- I frequently try to avoid projects that I know will be difficult.
- When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw.
- The things in life that are easiest to do bring me the most pleasure.
- I dislike really hard tasks that stretch my abilities to the limit.

- I almost always feel better when I am on the move than when I am sitting and thinking.
- I would rather go out and do things than sit at home and read.
- I try to look out for myself first (even if it means making things difficult for other people).

- I like to test myself every now and then by doing something a little risky.
- Sometimes I will take a risk just for the fun of it.
- Excitement and adventure are more important to me than security.

- If I had a choice, I would always do something physical rather than something mental.

- I'm not very sympathetic to other people even when they are having problems.
- If things I do upset people, it's their problem not mine.
- I will try to get the things I want even when I know it's causing problems for other people.

- I lose my temper pretty easily.
- Often, when I'm angry at people I feel more like hurting them than talking to them about why I am angry.
- When I'm really angry, other people better stay away from me.
- When I have a serious disagreement with someone, it's usually hard for me to talk calmly about it without getting upset.

APPENDIX G

Table G.1: Gender of Harm Doer

	Trial							
	One		Two		Three		Four	
Gender	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0 = Female	816	39.8	1052	51.2	1012	49.3	1207	58.8
1 = Male	1236	60.2	1000	48.8	1040	50.7	845	41.2
Total	2052	100.0	2052	100.0	2052	100.0	2052	100.0

Table G.2: Age of Harm Doer

	Trial							
	One		Two		Three		Four	
Age	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1 = 18-year-old	711	34.6	675	32.9	739	36.0	597	29.1
2 = 35-year-old	700	34.1	628	30.6	715	34.8	735	35.8
3 = elderly	642	31.3	748	36.5	598	29.1	721	35.1
Total	2052	100.0	2052	100.0	2052	100.0	2052	100.0

Table G.3: Level of Intensity

	Trial							
	One		Two		Three		Four	
Intensity	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Low	691	33.7	686	33.4	680	33.2	681	33.2
Medium	686	33.4	670	32.7	694	33.8	686	33.4
High	675	32.9	695	33.9	678	33.0	685	33.4
Total	2052	100.0	2052	100.0	2052	100.0	2052	100.0

Table G.4: Respondent Alone

	Trial							
	One		Two		Three		Four	
Alone	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
0 = Not Alone	1173	57.2	1279	62.3	1207	58.8	1499	73.0
1 = Alone	879	42.8	773	37.7	845	41.2	553	27.0
Total	2052	100.0	2052	100.0	2052	100.0	2052	100.0

APPENDIX H

Table H.1: Willingness to Use Force by Scenario and Gender (% Yes)

	Respondent	
Scenario	Males	Females
Schoolyard	10.1 % (N = 25)	5.6% (N = 14)
Worker	6.5% (N = 16)	1.9% (N = 5)
Customer	3.5% (N = 9)	.9% (N = 3)
Convenience Store	13.8% (N = 33)	11.7% (N = 29)
Robbery	54% (N = 122)	35% (N = 99)
Traffic Accident	4.9% (N = 14)	2.3% (N = 7)
Spousal	20.2% (N = 50)	10.1% (N = 28)
Child	22.8% (N = 60)	16.7% (N = 51)
Neighbor	1.2% (N = 3)	.0% (N = 0)
Sporting Event	14.3% (N = 36)	9.1% (N = 23)
Pub	14.5% (N = 37)	5% (N = 14)
Vacation	5.7% (N = 14)	1.0% (N = 3)

APPENDIX I

Gender of Respondent * Gender of Harm Doer * Respondent Alone

The table below was created to examine the nature of the interaction—or non-interaction—between *Gender of Respondent*, *Gender of Harm Doer* and *Respondent Alone*.

Table I.1: Use of Force by Gender-dynamic and* Respondent Alone *by Trial (%Yes)

	Trial							
	One		Two		Three		Four	
Gender-Dynamic	Alone	Not Alone	Alone	Not Alone	Alone	Not Alone	Alone	Not Alone
Male-Male	10.6% N = 21	12.8% N = 54	23.9% N = 53	25.6% N = 70	19.7% N = 36	29.6% N = 97	13.6% N = 27	15% N = 38
Male-Female	2.5% N = 6	2.8% N = 4	11.8% N = 17	19.5% N = 71	11.7% N = 25	10.5% N = 30	3.8% N = 3	6.0% N = 30
Female-Female	1.6% N = 4	2.8% N = 5	13.1% N = 21	18.4% N = 69	10.4% N = 25	6.7% N = 18	2.8% N = 3	4.9% N = 25
Female-Male	1.6% N = 3	3.6% N = 15	12.9% N = 31	10.9% N = 28	9.3% N = 19	13.6% N = 43	2.7% N = 5	5.0% N = 11

Table I.1 shows that with the exception of the cells referring to the use of force between two males in Trial Three, the differences in the use of force by gender-dynamic and Respondent Alone are too small to draw firm conclusions. In Trial Three, male respondents faced with a male target were more likely to use physical force when they were not alone; however, they were slightly less likely to use physical force against a female in the presence of bystanders.

Keeping in mind that the numbers are very small, and therefore that any interpretation of these findings must be extremely cautionary, there are likely both physical and normative explanatory components for both male and female respondents. First, from a physical standpoint, males who are faced with a male target may believe that force is more necessary, and that in the presence of bystanders if force is used, those bystanders will intervene if the situation escalates. In contrast, when faced with a female target, more often than not, males will likely feel that the use of force is not necessary. Second, from a normative standpoint, male respondents who are faced with a male target may be more likely to use physical force in the presence of others as a means for maintaining masculinity and honour. In contrast, when faced with a female harm doer, more often than not social norms say that physical force used by males against females is not acceptable. At the same time, this research has shown that situation can be more powerful than gender norms, thus explaining why opposite-gender encounters in the presence of bystanders may not always result in less use of force.

With regard to female respondents, when faced with a female target they are more likely to use force in the presence of bystanders as opposed to when they are alone in all but Trial Three. Interestingly, when faced with a male target they are more likely to use force in the presence of bystanders as opposed to when they are alone in all but Trial Two. In terms of explaining these findings it is suggested that while situational factors will influence the attitudes of females towards the use of force just as with males, the translation of those attitudes into behavior may be mediated by perceived physical threat more so than for males. Thus, the fact that females are more likely to use physical force in the presence of others overall, may be explained more by physical rather than normative factors. When others are present, there is a clear and perhaps even assumed possibility that others will intervene on their behalf.

Of course there were two exceptions to this general finding which require further explanation. First, in Trial Two the fact that females are slightly less likely to use force against a male target in the presence of others may reflect the fact that they believe that someone will intervene before the use of force becomes necessary. In contrast, when they are alone they may feel that they have no choice but to engage in the use of force for the purpose of self-defence. Second, the greater use of force against another female in the absence of bystanders in Trial Three may be explained by the fact that when others are not present, if force becomes an option, females are more likely to take on another female as opposed to a male.